

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

53

---

VOL. I. NEW SERIES.

---

JULY—OCTOBER,

MDCCCLXIII.

PUBLIC LIBRARY,

DETROIT, MICH.

SEP 17 1888

LONDON:

BURNS & LAMBERT, 17 & 18 PORTMAN STREET,

AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

DERBY: RICHARDSON AND SONS.

1863.

LONDON:  
COX AND WYMAN, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,  
LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.



## CONTENTS.—No I.

ART.	PAGE
I. POPULAR DEVOTION IN SPAIN.....	1
Historia Ecclesiastica de España. Por D. Vicente de la Fuente. 4 vols. Barcelona : Libreria Religiosa. 1859.	
II. THE ABYSSINIAN SCHISM .....	33
1. Ludolfi Historia Æthiopica. Francofurti ad Mænum. 1681.	
2. Bruce's Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile. 5 vols. Edinburgh : 1790.	
3. The Highlands of Æthiopia. By Major Harris. 3 vols. London : Longmans. 1844.	
4. Life in Abyssinia. By Mansfield Parkyns. 2 vols. London : J. Murray. 1853.	
5. Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours in Eastern Africa. By the Rev. Dr. Krapf. London : Trübner & Co. 1860.	
6. Wanderings among the Fálashas of Abyssinia. By Rev. H. Stern. London : Wertheim, Macintosh, & Hunt. 1862.	
III. INTRINSIC END OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT .....	66
Du Spirituel et du Temporel dans l'Eglise. Lettre de Mon- seigneur [Parisis] l'Evêque d'Arras à Son Excellence M. Thouvenel. Paris : 1860.	
IV. ROSA FERRUCCI .....	111
Rosa Ferrucci : ses Lettres et sa Mort. Par l'Abbé Henri Perreyve. Paris : Douniol, 1858.	
V. THE WORK AND THE WANTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND .....	139
An Account of the State of the Roman-Catholic Religion throughout the World. Written for the use of Pope Innocent XI. by Monsignor Cerri, Secretary of the Congregation de Propa- ganda Fide. Now first translated from an authentick Italian MS. never published. To which is added a Discourse concerning the State of Religion in England ; written in French in the time of King Charles I., and now first translated. With a large Dedi- cation to the present Pope, giving Him a very particular account of the State of Religion amongst Protestants ; and of several other matters of importance relating to Great Britain. By Sir Richard Steele. London : Printed for J. Roberts, near the Oxford Arms, in Warwick Lane. MDCCXV.	

ART.	PAGE
<i>Essays and Miscellaneous Literature.</i>	
VI. HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.....	170
Part. I. From the Beginning of the Movement to the Publication of Tract 90 (exclusive).	
VII. THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.....	191
VIII. NOTICES OF BOOKS .....	220
Tarquini de Jure Ecclesiastico Publico—Dr. Murray's Tractatus de Ecclesia—Dr. Pusey's Minor Prophets—Armellini de Prisca Refutatione Hæreseon, Origenis Nomine ac Philosophoumenon titulo recens vulgata—Villari's History of Savonarola—Vies de V. Agnès de Jésus; B. Esprite de Jésus; V. Jeanne Marie de la Croix; et Madame Acarie—Wenham's Letter on Management of Schools—Formby's Inquiry of Retired Citizen into Roman Catholic Religion—Stories from Old Testament—The Church Establishment in Ireland, illustrated by Protestant authorities—Robertson's Secret Mission to Danish Islands—MacCarthy on the Memoirs of the Marquis de Villars—Memoir of Dr. Blomfield—Kingsley's Water-Babies—V. Grignon de Montfort's Treatise on True Devotion to B. Virgin—Vita di Francesca de Maistre, con Memorie di Benedetta Medolago Albani—Westlake's Hymns and Sacred Part-Songs—Croiset's Devotion to Sacred Heart—The Lamp—Marshall's Christian Missions—Father Hutchison's Holy House of Loreto.	
IX. FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE .....	262
La Civiltà Cattolica—Le Correspondant.	

## CONTENTS.—No. II.

---

ART.	PAGE
<p>I. DR. HOOK'S LIVES OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., Dean of Chichester. Vol. II. Anglo-Norman Period. Second edition. London: Bentley. 1862.</p> <p>II. THE CURÉ OF ARS .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Le Curé d'Ars. Vie de Jean-Baptiste-Marie Vianney. Publiée sous les yeux et avec l'approbation de Mgr. l'Évêque de Belley. Par l'Abbé Alfred Monnin, Missionnaire. 2 Vols. Paris: Douniol. 1861.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Life of the Curé d'Ars. From the French of the Abbé Alfred Monnin. Second edition. London: Burns &amp; Lambert. 1863.</p> <p>III. PRISON MINISTERS ACT .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">An Act for the Amendment of the Law relating to the Religious Instruction of Prisoners in County and Borough Prisons in England and Scotland. London: Printed by George Edward Eyre &amp; William Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty. 1863.</p> <p>IV. THE NEWLY DISCOVERED JEWISH CATACOMB AT ROME .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Cimitero degli Antichi Ebrei, scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini. Illustrato per Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma: Coi Tipi della Civiltà Cattolica. 1862.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Vetri Ornati di Figure in Oro, trovati nei Cimiteri dei Cristiani Primitivi di Roma. Raccolti e spiegati da Raffaele Garrucci, D.C.D.G. Roma: Salviucci. 1858.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Letters from Rome to Friends in England. By the Rev. John W. Burgon, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: Murray. 1862.</p> <p>V. THE LETTERS OF S. TERESA.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Lettres de Sainte Térèse, traduites suivant l'ordre chronologique. Edition enrichie de lettres inédites, de notes, et de biographies, par le P. Marcel Bouix, de la Compagnie de Jésus. 3 tom. Paris: Lecoffre et Cie.</p>	<p>275</p> <p>322</p> <p>356</p> <p>397</p> <p>419</p>

ART.	PAGE
VI. THE DOGMATIC PRINCIPLE.....	458
<p>Undogmatic Christianity. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, May 3, 1863, by the Rev. Walter Waddington Shirley, M.A. London and Oxford : Parker.</p> <p>The Unity of Evangelical and Apostolical Teaching. Sermons preached mostly in Canterbury Cathedral. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. London : Murray. 1859.</p>	
VII. THE CATHOLIC CONGRESS OF MALINES .....	482
<p>Assemblée Générale des Catholiques en Belgique. Première Session à Malines, 18—22 Aout, 1863. Programme des Travaux—Questions—Projets de Solution—Propositions. Bruxelles : Imprimerie de Th. Lesigne.</p> <p><i>Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.</i></p>	
VIII. HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.....	494
<p>Part. II.—Tract 90 : its Antecedents, Motives, Object, and immediate Results.</p>	
IX. NOTICES OF BOOKS .....	509
<p>Mgr. Manning's Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects—Tischendorf's Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum—Valroger's Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres du Nouveau Testament—Schwane's Dogmengeschichte der voricänischen Zeit—Madden's Galileo and the Inquisition—Lyell and Poole on the Antiquity of Man—Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church—Sighart's Albert le Grand—Mathieu's Livre de Prières—Cartier's Vie de Fra Angelico—Cartier's Dialogue et Lettres de S. Catharine de Sienne—Bouix's Œuvres Spirituelles de S. Pierre d'Alcantara—Bouix's La Solitaire des Rochers—Sixth Report of Inspector appointed to visit Reformatory and Industrial Schools—Parkinson's Lecture on Education—Anderdon's Adventures of Owen Evans—Wood's Glimpses into Petland—Blot's Auxiliatrices du Purgatoire—Question des Sœurs de la Charité en Portugal.</p>	
X. FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE .....	568
<p>Etudes Religieuses, Historiques et Littéraires—Le Correspondant—La Civiltà Cattolica.</p>	
XI. FOREIGN EVENTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST .....	583
<p>Polish Insurrection—Fausti Trial—Procession of the Santissimo Salvatore—Neapolitan States—Piedmont and Italy.</p>	

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

JULY, 1863.

---

ART. I.—POPULAR DEVOTION IN SPAIN.

*Historia Ecclesiastica de España.* Por D. Vicente de la Fuente. 4 vols.  
Barcelona : Libreria Religiosa. 1859.

NO man is sufficient for himself. He is, and must be, dependent upon others. Almighty God, who created him in this state of dependency, has written in his heart the law of mutual love; and His own divine lips have pronounced that the love of our neighbour is one with the love of God. Nations in like manner are dependent upon one another. The whole system of commerce, of trade and barter, carried on as it is with such wear and tear, such infinite risks of danger, bloodshed, rebellion, war, is founded upon the primary axiom that we are all dependent upon one another; that the whole world is but one family, the members of which minister to each other's wants. No member can be treated with contempt or despised, because it is useful to the body, and the hour may come which will both prove and make manifest its uses. Many consider it to be the glory of this nation that this law of dependency has received a wide practical development in that gigantic system of commerce with which, as with a net, we encircle the whole globe. They have no difficulty in admitting that we must knock at the doors of other nations and enter in, receiving for our daily use, from one cotton, or hemp, or silk; from another various precious timbers; from another rare and dainty meats; from another fruits; from another scents and spices; from another gold, silver, lead;—even distant seas have to contribute their coral and their pearl, as well as their strange living creatures, in order to supply the ever-increasing demands, to minister to the ever-growing dependency of one portion of the human family upon the rest. How often may we hear a portly and, to use that expression so characteristic of modern ideas, respectable-looking gentleman gravely asserting that *everything* can be got in London, in which comprehensive term he takes special care to inform us that he

includes all that is edible. With a sort of honest pride, a conscious dignity and self-respect, many an Englishman congratulates himself on the fact that there are no waters over which our ships do not sail, no ports from which they do not bring to England some commercial tribute; no nation can compare with ours in its fleet of merchantmen; no other country can present us with a tithe of the appliances and means of comfort and luxury that we enjoy; the energy of our race not only has discovered but has appropriated to itself more varied and fruitful sources of wealth than are possessed by any other people on the face of the globe.

Without disputing the truth of all this, what, we would ask, is the principle contained in these self-congratulatory assertions? In its ultimate analysis it is this,—that the greatest nation is the one which is the least satisfied with itself, and is the most dependent upon others. As Emerson declares that “the greatest man is the most indebted man,” so it may be affirmed of nations that the greatest is the most indebted. Indeed, this principle may be said to have reached its apogee when the system of free trade received the sanction of the British Legislature.

So much, then, for the fact that England’s material greatness is due to the persevering energy and determination with which she has naturalized, and we may say Anglicized, the wealth and resources of foreign countries. We have thought it no derogation to our national dignity to become receivers and learners, rejecting nothing that might increase our material prosperity. And here the question suggests itself, how far have we carried out this principle in the higher order of morality? What have we borrowed from other nations? In what measure have we been anxious to advance our people in the moral scale, by introducing among them the thoughts, feelings, practices, and habits of other nations, where these are manifestly higher in tone and more in accordance with the spirit of Christianity than our own? Have we been as zealous to learn how we may raise our labouring poor from a condition more nearly resembling that of beasts of burden than of a Christian population? Where is the joy and sweetness of life, the intelligence in spiritual things, the ready, facile charity, the real refinement which we find among the peasantry of Catholic countries? In truth, it must be confessed that we have adopted the principle of free trade in commerce, but have ignored it as respects that interchange of moral influences by which nations can confer on each other the most solid benefits. In the pursuit of material prosperity we have run all over the world, but in all that affects the spiritual interests of our people

we have shut ourselves up within ourselves, and have treated other countries with absolute contempt. The cause of this, no doubt, may be found partly in that vein of pride and haughtiness which the English character has derived from its Norman admixture ; but much more in the nature of Protestantism, which persists in adhering to its one article of faith—its own sufficiency, while its people are sinking into the lowest depths of immorality and crime.

That the separation from the unity of the Church has been the chief cause of the peculiarity to which we have adverted, is evident from the fact that the same reproach cannot with equal justice be addressed to the Catholics of this country. If, from our common national character, we have been slow to learn and adopt the practices of others, and to copy whatever was worthy of imitation in their pious institutions, our religion, at all events, has helped us over this stumbling-block, and we have successfully naturalized much that once was foreign to us. We have crossed the Channel, and have done something towards supplying the faults and deficiencies in our workhouse system, for we have scarcely a town without its society of S. Vincent de Paul, whose members unite to the relief of corporal necessities that gentle kindness and love for their suffering brethren with which our holy religion inspires them. And now, of late, the *Petites Sœurs*—Little Sisters of the Poor—another French institution, have been introduced into our great towns, so that the old and destitute may receive from the generous and devoted hearts of women, who have consecrated themselves to God and to His poor, a sympathy and a tenderness which perhaps they have never known before. Then, too, we have out-door Nursing-Sisters and Hospital-Sisters, and other communities and works of foreign origin which it is not necessary to designate by name.

The fact is, if we have an earnest desire that the English people should one day exhibit the religious devotedness and sanctity for which the land had become famous before the Norman set foot upon its shores, we must in every way guard ourselves against a development of the nationalism, pride, and ambition which were the characteristics of that arrogant and overbearing race. To these qualities in the dominant class the contests about investiture, the hatred of the stranger, the trampling upon ecclesiastical rights, the suspicion and jealousy of Rome, the perpetual encroachments for 500 years of the State upon the Church, must be attributed. The Reformation, when it came, was but the legitimate growth, the fully ripened fruit, of those evil seeds which had been germinating for centuries. True greatness in religion was incompatible with



the *natural* development of the Norman character. The Church succumbed under it, and was wellnigh trodden out of the land. If it has sprung up again, it may be rather compared to the young underwood that succeeds the fallen forest. While tender and pliant and full of hope, it cannot be expected to yield the variety of beauty, the light and shade, the protection and retreat, afforded by the ancient trees, whose roots had ramified for ages in the soil below, and whose branching arms had twisted and intertwined themselves above in every form of mutual complication and embrace.

As England in the natural and material order may be considered as it were the focus of the commercial activity of the world, so is Rome in the supernatural and spiritual order the great religious mart and the centre of intercommunion and exchange. Herself absolutely supreme in authority, and infallible in her teaching, she rejects nothing that is good, from whatever quarter it may emanate. To her nothing that is praiseworthy, or honourable, or of good report, is foreign. Without envy she receives and learns of all, and without jealousy she gives and communicates to all. Her College of Cardinals admits natives of every country and clime. We can hardly realize her form and spirit until we have made ourselves acquainted with her great religious orders and communities—the Franciscan, the Dominican, the Jesuit, the Theatine, the Redemptorist, and others; yet the Jesuit and Dominican came from Spain, the Franciscan from Umbria, the Theatine and Redemptorist from Naples. And many of the most popular devotions and practices, such as the Quarant' Ore, Via Crucis, Missions, Retreats, devotion to the Sacred Heart, to S. Joseph, the Angelus, and many more, which have become as much identified with Rome as the very monuments out of which she is built,—these were not born to her, but were adopted and appropriated by her: *omnes isti congregati sunt, venerunt tibi*. Like Solomon, she has “made a market in all the kingdoms of the earth.” This generous largeness, this willingness to be recipient, and to adopt whatever is good, without regard to the whisperings of a petty national pride or a dread of foreign innovation, as it has its primal seat in the central heart of Christendom, so may it be regarded as the measure of the truly Catholic spirit in every portion of the Church; and it appears to us that nothing can be more desirable for the nascent Church in England, after joining together so closely and intricately the bonds which unite her to Rome that nothing shall ever again be able to dissolve them, than to imitate the example of the Mother and Mistress of Churches, and profit to the greatest possible extent by the experience of other countries: “*The wise*



*man shall pass into strange countries, for he shall try good and evil among men."* (Ecclus. xxxix. 5.)

To contribute in our measure towards an end intrinsically so desirable, we propose, as occasion serves, to lay before our readers some details of the religious practices and habits of Catholic lands. Not that we would seek to naturalize in England the peculiar customs of any foreign country, beautiful and admirable as they may appear in our eyes. We are far from meaning that any nation should destroy or dwarf its natural character in order to adopt that of some other; and we are equally far from asserting that the character of every, or indeed of any, other nation is superior to our own. Our point is simply this,—that all nations have their special good qualities, and that all may learn of one another, as in the physical so in the moral order. Further, we would contend that those nations into which the Catholic religion has most deeply penetrated, moulding and fashioning throughout the spirit, habits, and inner life of the people, are those very nations from which we in England have most to learn; and that we should do well to go to them in the spirit of learners. The more eagerly one portion—or rather, we might say, the bulk—of the community is hurrying to the pursuit of material and secular objects, the more earnest heed would we have the Catholic portion give to whatever in the religious practices of other countries may minister to our supernatural needs and add to our spiritual wealth.

Of all the Catholic countries of Europe we may confidently say that Spain is that upon which the Catholic religion has made the most indelible impression. There have been special causes for this, into which, however, it is not our present purpose to enter. We will only briefly remark, first, that for the eight centuries during which Spain contended with Moorish domination on her soil, and conquered it back inch by inch from her Mahometan oppressors, her people were naturally led to throw themselves into the arms of religion with all the fervour of men suffering for justice sake. The wars with the Moors were holy wars, and within the breast of every Spaniard there burned perpetually the spirit of a soldier of the Cross. The impress thus received by the Spanish nation during the long process of its formation, continued to mould and master it in its days of internal peace and prosperity, and wrought itself into all the minutest details of its life and habits. And here, secondly, the geographical position of Spain lent its aid to the perpetuation of the impression which the national character had once received and to the traditional preservation of its local customs. For all practical purposes an island—for the Pyrenees cut it off

from France almost as effectually as the Mediterranean from Africa—its people possessed whatever advantages local isolation affords: they were thrown more upon themselves, and were less subject to those external influences which affected countries like France and Germany, the great high-roads of Europe. To this result the peculiar configuration of the land largely contributed, intersected as it was with vast sierras, huge mountain chains possessing difficult means of transit and little to attract the stranger, the solitude of whose upland valleys favoured the establishment of numerous convents, round which clustered a hardy people of simple manners, in whom the spirit of piety was nurtured by their monastic teachers. And then, lastly, we should add that the character of the people naturally lent itself, as a good ground, to the cultivation of the spiritual life. Though the Spanish Government was at times even in arms against Rome, though regalism in different reigns reached an alarming height, and Voltaireanism in its day infected the higher orders, yet the mass of the people were never much affected by the vices of the distant court, of which, as of the infidel doctrines afloat amongst the educated classes, they remained for the most part profoundly ignorant. Habitually ruled by that religion which was everywhere present with them, it was only when the sovereign was true to his faith, obeying its holy impulses instead of being the slave of his passions, that his influence, now in harmony with that which swayed the heart of the people, was felt throughout every village in the land. For it was then seconded and supported by the monks, whose lives were devoted to the service of God, and whose one idea was the establishment of His kingdom in the hearts of men.

These, then, briefly, seem to have been the chief means by which the purity and fervour of faith were maintained in the Catholic heart of Spain, in spite of the corruption of courts and the poison of infidel and revolutionary doctrines. When, however, we call to mind the deleterious influences to which the country has been subjected for more than half a century, we need not wonder should we find that much of the old simple piety has departed. Our desire is to collect a few of the flowers which survive the hurricane, so that in some small way we may gather for ourselves, if not actual specimens to transplant, at least some portion of their sweet fragrance wherewith to refresh and regale our languishing piety. We may imbibe something of the spirit where we cannot copy the form. Should any of our readers desire to make himself more fully acquainted with the particular devotional practices and the religious condition of Spain during past centuries, we would refer him to the "*Historia Ecclesiastica de España*," by

D. Vicente de la Fuente : for ourselves, we do but offer a few notes upon Spain as it may be seen to-day.

First of all we will conduct our readers through the narrow, ill-paved streets of some Spanish town—that of Seville for instance. Men, women, and children, in driblets, are going in and coming out of a church close by. Let us go in also. It is the early morning, and masses are being said at several altars. The church appears almost dark within,—the light was so bright and clear outside, with the already risen sun and cloudless sky. The blinds are drawn down over all the windows in the clerestory ; and it is but very rarely that a Spanish church has any other windows. They do not like the light to come in from openings lower down, according to the English Gothic plan. Windows within a few feet of the ground would offend their eye and distract their minds, besides occupying valuable space for side chapels, statues, and pictures. Moreover, they have more than enough light from above, so they diminish and soften it down with curtains. The whole body of the church is full of people—the women seated on the ground or kneeling (there are no chairs or benches), the men standing or kneeling. And the women are all dressed in black, and wear black mantillas or veils upon their heads ; so that a lady appearing in a coloured dress would be altogether out of place, and attract attention by her singularity. The fashion in the church of God here is modesty, simplicity, and gravity of colour. The idea is that we go to church to appear before God as sinners, penitents, and suppliants—as children passing through a valley of tears ; and to come decked out in the plumage of birds of paradise would be shocking to the Spanish mind, and out of harmony with the thought that we are the fallen children of Adam. And such a practice is in strict accordance with that regulation prescribed by the Supreme Pontiff in Rome, who requires, at least when he is present, that women should appear in the church in grave and simple black. Protestantism has no sense or instincts with which to appreciate the meaning and fitness of such a rule, and its adherents have accordingly set a fashion in dress which is as elaborate and brilliant for the church as for a promenade ; and how contagious fashion is, we all can say. One marked advantage of this Catholic practice is that the poor are not shamed away on account of their soiled or tattered clothes. The excuse of not having clothes good enough to go to church in is not known in Spain.

Let us cast our eyes up the church, and what do we behold ? Here is a lady of wealth and rank, who has come from her palace hard by, and she is kneeling, their skirts touching one another, close to the poor woman who, as is her wont, has

just snatched half an hour from her daily work to come and hear mass. To the casual observer there is, externally, but little difference between them. The lady may have on a mantilla and a dress that is spotless, whereas her neighbour has perhaps a cotton handkerchief tied over her head, and a skirt that once was clean and black, but now from long wear is soiled and rusty; but this is all. They both have their beads in their hands, and both are telling them; and they join in the mass together, sitting, and kneeling, and striking their breast, and crossing themselves with the priest. They fit admirably well together: there is no incongruity; and even the poor beggar-girl close by, kneeling near the high altar, and surrounded by what in England are called her "betters," ladies by education and position, evidently has no idea that her proper place is at the bottom of the church, and that a due sense of decorum ought to have kept her from venturing on such close proximity to persons from whom she craves an alms in the street as they pass by. No, the church, with all its beauty and splendour of gilded carving, *churrigueresque*\* though it be, and its pictures, and its painted statues, decked out in velvet and silk, and gold and silver, belongs to the poor beggar-girl, and she feels and knows that it does, just as much as to the marquesa who presented the high altar with the six superb gold candlesticks that stand upon it. The church throughout Spain, as in every truly Catholic country, is the home of the poor. As our dear Lord during life chose to dwell among the poor, so the poor now feel that they have the privilege to go in and out of His house, and to be *close to Him*, and that nobody, even silently, can question their right.

We have not been in the church half-an-hour before our English ear is assailed by the cries and wailings of a child. Almost instinctively we turn round, and expect to see a respectable beadle rising to the height of his dignity, and about to perform part of the acknowledged duty of that functionary by marching both mother and child out of the sacred precincts. But not at all; and we feel an interior reproach in perceiving that we alone have been distracted by the noise. The mother had wished to hear mass, and she had no one with whom to leave her poor peevish child; so, of course, she brought it with

---

\* Architecture succumbed under the influence of Churriguera, whose name, like that of a heresiarch, has become synonymous in Spain with his doctrine, and with all that is false and vile in taste: thus, *el Churriguerismo*, *Churrigueresco*, is used in the sense of *Rococo*. . . . There is scarcely a village in Spain whose parish church has escaped the harpy touch of this fatal epoch.—*Ford*.

her to church, without fear of a public expulsion, or so much as a harsh word or a reproachful look. It is the custom of the country: each respects the other's right to hear mass; and those little trials and annoyances which are inseparable from poverty and the presence of the poor are borne cheerfully and naturally as matters of course. Nay, habit has so familiarized the Catholic worshipper to such distractions, that they cease to be distractions, and are no more disturbing than the sounds and the noises which penetrate into our churches from our teeming London streets, and which we scarcely hear because we have become accustomed to them.

Here and there, too, may be observed a woman engaged with a child. At one time she looks affectionately into his face—a little boy, perhaps, of five years old,—and at another her eyes are earnestly directed towards the altar; while her arms are partly folded round him, as she holds his little hands. What is she doing? She is teaching him the meaning of the Holy Sacrifice, as the great act proceeds; and she is helping him to pray. How could the mother be better employed? In what way could the dawning intelligence and attention of a child, restless as the little birds that are for ever flitting from bough to bough and from twig to twig, be more gently and gladly constrained to esteem and take part in the most sacred of our sacred mysteries? When the child grows to be a man, we are not surprised to find him walking straight into the sacristy of a morning, to see if there be a mass to serve. And in Spain, even in these degenerate days, there are more men to be found, persons of education and often of noble birth, who esteem it a privilege to serve, or, as they say, "*ayudar*"—i.e., to help—the mass of some poor, ill-clad priest, than in any other country in the world; indeed, the rule is that every Spaniard knows how to serve mass.

There is throughout Spain the greatest reverence for the Holy Sacrifice, which at the altar shows itself by the use of two corporals, one laid out upon the other, and of two palls, one of which is used only from the Offertory to the Communion, and is then folded up in the corporals. At the Elevation a third candle is always lighted by the server, and placed upon the altar, there to remain as long as the sacred species remain; and in the great patriarchal church in Valencia a sacristan appears with a thurible, even in low mass, in order to honour with incense the Real Presence of our Lord. Among the people generally, reverence is shown by the careful way in which they follow the parts of the mass, while they say their rosary—for the rosary is the "golden manual" of Spain,—or sometimes use a book; and by the numbers of the poor and middle

classes, as well as of the educated, who hear a daily mass. They say, "Misa y cebada no estorban jornada" ("To hear your mass, and to feed your horse, stop no day's journey"). We not long ago travelled through a part of Catalonia, the Lancashire of Spain, the great manufacturing district and the most industrious portion of the Peninsula. It was the feast of S. Matthias, a day on which there is a precept to hear mass, though servile work is allowed. At twelve o'clock we observed streaming out of the factories towards the parish church of Monistral about 800 men and women. It was their dinner-time, and the hour to rest from work; and they were all going, as a matter of course, to hear their mass of obligation. We fear there is not the same fervour everywhere among masters or workmen; but in every town and in many populous villages there is a confraternity of men who, on all days when to hear mass is a precept, rise long before the sun, and at three o'clock A.M. are walking the streets in procession, singing the rosary to the ringing of a hand-bell; and then about five o'clock the bell goes round through all the streets again, summoning all the labouring people to mass; and though the church may be almost dark when the Holy Sacrifice begins, you will constantly find it full of the silent, hardy worshippers. The Blessed Sacrament is commonly called "Su Magestad" (His Majesty). You pay a visit to *His Majesty*, and handbills on the wall announce that a function will take place, &c., "in the presence of His Most August Majesty, in the Blessed Sacrament of our Altars." The sovereign of the country, if she meets the Most Holy in the streets being borne to the sick or dying, alights from her carriage, and gives it up to the priest who bears It; thus resigning her royal honours to the King of kings, that she may follow in His train on foot, like the humblest of her subjects. So truly has this devotion become an integral portion of the religious life of the nation. The prayer which is known and said by every Spaniard who prays at all, which is taught him as a child, and is the beginning of every private prayer, and is recited in the pulpit before every sermon, is called "El Bendito," and runs thus: "Blessed and praised for ever be the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar, and the Immaculate Conception of the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lady, conceived without stain of original sin in the first instant of her most pure being. Amen." And the Spanish catechism, answering the question "Where is Jesus Christ?" tells the child, "In Heaven, and in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar." One portion of the doctrine comes home to him from infancy as naturally and familiarly as the other.



Nowhere in Europe is the Blessed Sacrament so frequently exposed in the church for veneration. Every town of any importance has its Jubiléo Circular—that is, its Quarant' Ore—all the year round, moving every three days from church to church. And in order to be able to carry on the devotion all through the year without pressing too heavily on towns where the churches are in smaller number, the Holy See has granted permission that the Blessed Sacrament should be taken down at night, and that the term of forty hours should be completed during three consecutive days. The advantage of this is very great. The devotion of the people is provided for, the churches are not too heavily taxed, the difficulty of night watching, which is a considerable charge in a small town all the year round, is obviated, the indulgences are equally applicable, and places which otherwise could not enjoy the privilege are blessed with the presence of our Lord seated on His sacramental throne to receive the homage of the inhabitants, listen to their requests, and bestow His favours.

Nor must we omit to mention the extraordinary processions which take place throughout Spain on the feast of Corpus Christi. All the figures of the old law typical of the Blessed Sacrament appear in these processions: an old man is dressed up as Melchisedec, bearing bread and wine; others carry between them, on a pole, two heavy bunches of grapes; then follows the paschal lamb, with other mystical symbols; to which succeed enormous giants, representing, in traditional costumes, the four quarters of the world, confessing and adoring the Great Mystery of the Altar; while boys and youths, attired in the garb of people of every race and colour, and armed with their national weapons, surround the Blessed Sacrament, showing how all nations and tribes should unite together to defend and do homage to our Divine Lord, hidden under the lowly species; and as David danced before the Ark when carried in procession, so they modestly dance before the Blessed Sacrament as It is triumphantly borne along. Little books, explanatory of it all, are sold by the poor and the blind. Children eagerly ask their mothers the meaning of these various figures; the poor gaze, year by year, upon many of the most beautiful types of the Old Testament; and so all learn without effort, and their devotion kindles as they learn. In Valencia this ceremonial is especially striking; but every town and village has its procession of Corpus Christi, marked by some peculiar illustration of the popular devotion.

The national reverence for the Blessed Sacrament naturally develops itself in a corresponding respect for priests, who are its ministers. Thus, in the streets, not only gentlemen, but

even ladies, will step off the narrow side-pavement to allow a priest to pass; nor would even a high-born dame be at all pleased if a priest, poor and humble as he might be, offered to give her the precedence and make way for her. Such is the reverence shown to the sacred character, which poverty and lowliness, so far from obscuring, often only serve to bring out into stronger relief. So, too, the custom prevails throughout the country of kissing the priest's hands—those hands that are daily sanctified by holding the Body and Blood of Christ, and from which are continually proceeding blessings in His name. The children in the streets will stop any priest they see passing along, calling out to him "*La mano, la mano*" ("the hand, the hand")—not "*your hand*," but "*the hand*," the hand which has been anointed and is a holy thing. And then they kiss it, and if the priest blesses them, they say "*Amen*." To pass by a school that is breaking up is really a serious consideration for a priest who is in a hurry, for he is besieged on all sides with cries of "*La mano*," and this in a country where a priest is not, as in England, a *rara avis*, but where now, as for centuries, he may be met with at every turn. As a further illustration of the national respect for the sacerdotal character, it may be added that every private soldier salutes a priest as though he were one of his recognized superiors, whom he looks up to and reveres. In England it has often been questioned whether a secular priest should be called father in virtue of his priestly office. In Spain, as in Catholic Ireland, the custom among the people is to look upon the priest as a father, whether he be a secular or a religious; and the people commonly speak of him as "*Padre Cura*" ("Father Rector"), or by whatever other office he may hold among them. So Cardinal Borromeo thought he was only returning to the just and primitive practice, and to that of the Roman ritual, when he decreed that the Oblates of Milan, though simple secular priests, should be called by no other title than that of father.

There is throughout Spain a great devotion to the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. Whatever name a child receives in baptism, there is usually added to it that of the Holy Trinity. The form runs thus, for instance—Joseph, Mary, OF THE MOST HOLY TRINITY, I baptize thee, &c. Sometimes the name of the Blessed Sacrament is added. The Trisagium, a prayer known by everybody, and commonly recited in the evening after the rosary, is taught to children from their earliest years. It is in constant use, and runs thus:—

Blessed and praised be the Most Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts. Full are the heavens and



earth of the majesty of Thy glory. Glory to the Father, glory to the Son, glory to the Holy Ghost. To which is often added :—

I believe in the Most Holy Trinity ;  
I hope in the Most Holy Trinity ;  
I love the Most Holy Trinity ;  
I am sorry for having offended the Most Holy Trinity ;  
I desire to see the Most Holy Trinity. Amen.

This devotion to the highest of all mysteries, which the religious Protestant mind so often shrinks even from considering, is so dear to the Spanish heart, that it seeks an outward expression in pictures and statues, which we see continually in private houses, churches, and even in the highways : for instance, in the midst of the great broad road by the Guadalquivir, in Seville, stands a magnificent pile representing the Blessed Trinity, erected at the public expense as an act of devotion.

It has been supposed by some, and is so set down by Mr. Ford in his "Handbook," that not only is Mariolatry supreme in Spain, but that "the Almighty is robbed of his prerogative, and his sceptre rendered barren, to the exclusion and derogation of the 'only one name and none other'" (p. 913 and *passim*). We will not stop to notice further, much less to refute, a work which disgusts even many a Protestant traveller. We cannot, however, refrain from expressing our regret that an author who to the qualifications of good scholarship has added the merit of considerable reading and research, should not have adhered more faithfully to the authorities on which he has professedly rested his statements, and still more that he should not only have disfigured his pages with an unworthy display of conceit and affectation, but have sacrificed truth and delicacy to the gratification of a stupid prejudice, and even to the more effective turn of a sentence, to a degree we have never seen equalled in any similar publication. The only refutation we will offer of the vulgar charge brought against the popular devotions of Spain shall be of the simplest practical kind. We will tell how the Spaniard celebrates that which is to him, as it is to all Catholics, the most solemn and sacred time of the year—Passiontide, and the Lent which precedes it. And here it is not out of place to note that the hours of the sermons and services, which take place daily during Lent in every church of any pretensions, together with the names of the preachers (as indeed is the practice throughout the year), are advertised in all the daily and weekly newspapers. So closely

does religion enter into the calculations and habitual life of the people, that they require this information even of the notoriously uncatholic journals, whose editors, so far from making a charge for insertion, employ and pay a person for collecting all such ecclesiastical details. The system of advertising every religious function has sprung out of the wants and claims of the people; and rightly has the Church availed herself of so simple a means for keeping the blessings of which she is the dispenser constantly before the eyes of her children, even in *cafés*, and inns, and places of public resort.

One of the most favourite devotions is that to the Holy Family, and it manifests itself most naturally during the season of which we are speaking. The feast of S. Joseph, or, as they commonly call him, "the Patriarch," almost always occurring in Lent, the usual series of sermons is interrupted by a seven or nine days' celebration in his honour. It were difficult to convey an idea of the fervour displayed by all good Catholics: the devotion becomes a sort of mission, at which crowds attend. In Seville it took place, at one and the same time, in no less than twenty-nine different churches. The feast of S. Joseph over, the Novena, or Septena, of his immaculate spouse, our Lady of Dolours, shortly afterwards begins. Our blessed Lady is honoured in Spain under the title of her Dolours more, perhaps, than under any other, unless it be that of her Immaculate Conception. It is a mystery of so practical a character, it is so often brought home to the heart of each one of us during this our mortal pilgrimage, and it is so closely and intimately connected with the sufferings of God Incarnate, that the theological mind of Spain has seized upon it with an especial affection. This is the great preparation for Passiontide: it becomes the occasion of another mission; and by an almost imperceptible transition the soul passes to the contemplation of the mysteries of the Passion, having been led on its way thereto by Joseph and by Mary.

The Roman ritual is followed in Spain as it is with us, and consequently there is little that is peculiar to the country in the regular liturgical services. On Palm Sunday issue forth the first processions of the *cofradías*; and so important a place do they occupy, that we must make an exception in their favour, and speak of them at somewhat greater length.

One of the most instructive and striking features in the religious institutions of Spain is the number of her confraternities, or brotherhoods. There is no country in the world so rich in these associations: in the past it was even richer; but they are still wonderfully numerous. Every kind of work of charity is undertaken by a confraternity, from the visiting of

the poor to the burying of the dead. The Society of S. Vincent de Paul is not only established, but, being well supplied with members, does its work efficiently in all the large towns; and many of the small and comparatively unimportant places in the interior of the country have their branch association. But what we now wish to call attention to is the number of confraternities that have for their object simply spiritual and devotional practices. Of these the confraternities that take part in the functions of Holy Week are the most conspicuous. The "*Historia Critica y Descriptiva de las Cofradias fundadas en la Ciudad de Sevilla*," por D. Felix Gonzalez de Leon (Sevilla, 1852), tells us that these confraternities date their origin from the fourteenth century, and that the first in Seville was that of *Santo Cristo della Fundacion y Maria Santisima de los Angeles*. The slave-trade was at that time being carried on upon a large scale, and Seville was one of the chief seats of the traders. The poor negroes were accustomed to obtain permission of their masters to unite together on Good Friday and at other times for religious exercises; they made processions and performed various acts of devotion. The archbishop of the day, Don Gonzalo de Mena, interested himself actively in the association, gave the negroes a chapel, and in various ways encouraged their zeal and piety. Others imitated the good example, and various confraternities were formed. Some wished to pay special honour to some particular mystery of the Passion, as the Prayer in the Garden; others the Condemnation, others again the Ecce Homo, and others the Crucifixion or Burial of our Lord; and thus, in course of time, as many different confraternities were formed as there were portions of the Passion which it was specially designed to honour. The mode in which they sought to testify their devotion to the mysteries under which they had enrolled themselves was by prayers and penances. In this manner they strove to realize in themselves the sufferings of our Lord, and to follow Him in His Passion; bearing with them through the streets pictures of our Redeemer, and carrying torches and lighted tapers in their hands. S. Vincent Ferrer, that apostle of the fifteenth century, visited and preached in Seville in 1408, and through his exhortations many of the confraternities adopted the public use of the discipline: hence, these brotherhoods became known by the names of *Cofradias de Penitencia, Sangre, y Luz*—Confraternities of Penance, Blood, and Light.

Each cofradia has its fixed day and hour for leaving its church in procession for a visit to the cathedral during Holy Week. The book before us gives a detailed account of no less than forty-one such confraternities in Seville alone.

They are distinguished by such names as the following, in addition to those already specified: "the Entry into Jerusalem," "the Last Supper," "Christ's Leave-taking of His Mother," "the Scourging at the Pillar," "Christ looking on Peter," "the Silence of Christ," "His Coronation," "His three Falls under the Cross," "the Seven Words," "the Conversion of the Penitent Thief," "the Solitude of Mary," &c. The mysteries which give their names to the confraternities are represented in statues dressed in rich robes according to the wealth of the members, and of a size larger than life. They are placed securely on a splendid platform, surrounded with tapers and lamps, and are thus borne slowly along to the cathedral upon the shoulders of some thirty men, and from the cathedral by another route to the church from which they issued. Moreover, each confraternity once during the year keeps with becoming splendour the feast-day of its mystery.

By degrees these confraternities grew in importance: they took the shape of regularly organized corporations under the jurisdiction of the archbishop, and even became the subject of synodical action. From time to time the civil authorities interfered, and on various occasions bore heavily upon them; abuses, too, arose, and there were litigations and feuds about precedency. At the present day many have lost the simplicity and spirit of penance with which they first began, and have manifested a certain tendency to luxury and pomp, which, however, confines itself for the most part to the magnificent images they carry in procession, which are covered with silver and gold and precious stones. But there are others which have retained their primitive austerity, and are composed of priests, as well as of many of the gentry. Some such as these are in almost every large town, and we shall have more to say about them when we come to speak of the Good Friday ceremonies.

Now, what is the effect which the sight of these processions carrying their *pasos* is calculated to produce upon the minds of the population? The effect must be immense. First, they are a public recognition in all the great thoroughfares of the land of the sufferings of Christ, and of their having been endured for us. The realities of our religion are brought home to every passer-by, be he denizen or stranger. They give a public character to the whole awful drama of Holy Week, and stamp the sacred events that are being commemorated on the popular mind. Secondly, the various parts of our Blessed Saviour's Passion are taught to children, the poor, and the ignorant, with an accuracy and a vividness which no book, no sermon, or oral instruction could give. A personal love for our Lord is inspired and fostered, as each beholder is drawn to the

consideration of that portion of the Passion which moves him most. The whole population is gathered together to watch the processions pass, and if they are not as grave and silent and solemn under an Andalusian sun as our northerners would be, it must be remembered that they are not the natives of a cold northern clime, and that they worship God none the less devoutly because the temperament of their mind is bright and cheerful rather than sad and sombre. We may observe, however, that we never remember to have seen such perfect order and decorum in any English crowd as in the concourse of the whole Sevillian population to witness the processions of the confraternities of Holy Week.

It is on Palm Sunday that the first processions go forth, but nothing remarkable takes place till the rending of the veil in the cathedral on Wednesday in Holy Week. On Maundy Thursday the Blessed Sacrament is reserved with an unusual splendour. In England an idea has prevailed, which no doubt came over from France, that this reservation during the day and night of Thursday is a commemoration of our Lord's entombment by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus. Indeed, we remember not unfrequently to have seen transparencies and pictures of our Lord in the tomb (forbidden though they are by the Congregation of Rites) under the altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is placed. To say nothing of the anachronism which such representations imply, the true idea is brought out in the most unmistakeable and striking manner in every church in Spain, both by priests and people.

It is the institution of the Holy Eucharist that is being celebrated,—far from the mind of everyone, therefore, the thought of constructing a tomb, however preciously decked with gold and silver, and blazing with lighted tapers. It must be a monument, a memorial, a commemoration, most sumptuous and glorious in its character, of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. And this is the form which that which we so often miscall the Sepulchre takes in every Spanish church. You see at once that the Blessed Sacrament is being treated, not with the sorrow and grief that befit a burial, but with the tender rejoicing of hearts that overflow with love and gratitude, and pour out, like Magdalen, their richest treasures to honour as best they can this Divine Gift and Giver. From early dawn on Maundy Thursday till Holy Saturday begins, not a cart or carriage or public conveyance moves through any of the streets of Spain; only the mails and diligences which traverse the country are allowed to perform their journeys. Maundy Thursday is a day on which the whole nation gratefully and lovingly rejoices. The people, after the

morning service, don their best attire, and all the women of the land, from the lady to the peasant, appear abroad in dresses of brilliant blue, and green, and red, and white, and pink, and violet, quite shocking to the taste of a Parisian, though English eyes are more accustomed to such kaleidoscopic combinations. Those who go to the church again in the evening return, of course, to their simple black; and on Good Friday the whole nation goes into mourning. Everybody appears in black; the shops are closed; the streets are silent and still.

At Seville, as early as two o'clock in the morning, the confraternity of Our Father Jesus of Nazareth issues forth from its church of S. Anthony in silence, and with bare feet, carrying torches and bearing along its magnificent *paso* to the cathedral, where its members visit our Lord in His splendid tabernacle, before the services of the day begin. From S. Laurence comes forth the confraternity of Our Father Jesus of Great Power, bearing a huge cross; and from S. Gil that of the Condemnation of Christ to death, and of Mary Most Holy, of Hope: these all proceed in silence and in prayer to the cathedral. During the day the soldiers march, or stand and keep guard, with their arms reversed; their drums are muffled, as when they mourn the death of some great commander; and it is touching to see them in the barrack square, when the rattle sounds all over the city from the cathedral tower, the Giralda, at twelve o'clock, doffing their forage-caps to say the Angelus,—for many are simple, faithful souls, who may be taken as fair specimens of the country parts from which they are recruited. In Madrid, when the sovereign goes up to adore the Cross, before she has made her third prostration, and kissed the sacred wounds of her Redeemer, an official interposes, and solicits the royal forgiveness for a certain number of prisoners who stand condemned to death. She responds aloud, in the hearing of all her court, that as she hopes God will forgive her her sins and remit the punishment due to them, so will she show mercy and remit the sentence of death which had been pronounced against these her subjects. On the last occasion, five criminals from different parts of the country thus received their pardon. The religious influence of such acts upon the nation was greater, no doubt, when the royal power was at its height, but even now the chord when struck still vibrates.

In the evening other *pasos* are carried in procession, and thus the public mind the whole day long is fixed upon the scenes that were enacted in Jerusalem on the day of our redemption. Pilate receives his meed of hatred, the barbarous Roman soldiers are abused with foulest words, the Jews are



loudly execrated. Then, again, the boys in the streets dress up in yellow rags a vile effigy of Judas, and load him with the most opprobrious epithets; they will then shoot at him with an old musket, and at last kick and beat him to pieces, or hang him and cut him open.

The devotion of the Three Hours' Agony is one that has a great attraction for the people. In some places it is accompanied with a ceremonial which, strange as it might look to unaccustomed eyes, and irreverent and even profane as it might be thought by those who never witnessed it, is productive of a solemn and most powerful effect. The last portion of the Passion is represented in all its circumstances by living men: there are the Jews, the soldiers, and the thieves; and there is our Lord himself. He who personates our Blessed Redeemer hangs for three hours upon the cross, and during that time the priest preaches, with this spectacle before the people's eyes, upon the last seven words and the sufferings and death of Christ; upon the particular virtues to be practised, and the special vices to be avoided. And all this is done with a gravity and a modesty which no one, however prejudiced, could gainsay. The simple earnest faith of the people is profoundly touched: it is no mere sacred drama that is being performed for their instruction—it is the dread Reality itself that is being enacted then and there before them. Nothing is more surely calculated to impress the imagination of the religious Spaniard (and, we will add, of any devout Catholic), as, assuredly, nothing from year's end to year's end is brought more powerfully and more vividly before his mind and eye. And if God would have us use our senses so as to help us on to heaven, why should we not use them in the way which helps us most? Whatever, then, the coldhearted, intellectually refined, and censorious critic may say of these displays of religious feeling and affection, Passiontide to the Spaniard *is* Passiontide, and he realizes all its sorrows and mysteries every year anew—as they certainly do not whose one idea of Good Friday is hot-cross buns for children, and salt fish before the meat for those who are older; or a trip down the river in a penny steamboat; or a day at the Crystal Palace, to hear Mr. Spurgeon, and see the lions.

Holy Saturday is called, "*Sabato de Gloria*:" the nation quits its mourning, the carts and carriages again ply up and down the streets, youths cry out with joy, "No more Lent, no more fasting till next year!" In the afternoon a market is held in every town, and parents take their children to buy their Easter lamb.

Here we may be met with a question: Do all these externals

which touch the senses terminate there? or do they correspond to an interior life of piety? We answer with a distinction,—that here, as elsewhere, there is the more and the less; the earnest and devout, the tepid and indifferent. We have been assured, however, as a matter of fact, by persons in a position to know, and to be able to speak without partiality, that in Catalonia, perhaps the most devout as well as the most industrious province of the Peninsula, the mass of the people communicate, on an average, once a month; and that many are weekly and even daily communicants. A meditation is read in the churches at nightfall, and pauses are made for reflection between the several points; music is sometimes introduced; and a short instruction, or the recital of the rosary, concludes the public devotions. It is thus that the people are taught to meditate. Another practice, which is of great benefit, especially to the uneducated, is this. The priest reads from the pulpit prayers, in the vernacular tongue, in honour of some mystery of our Blessed Lord's life or that of our Lady, and the people repeat the words aloud, sentence by sentence, as he reads them. Anything might be taught the people in this way. It is adopting publicly in the church a practice which has been found to be a most efficient method of teaching in our poor schools, especially when an explanation follows the prayers, or precedes them.

The people are well provided with books of devotion. We have noticed in the country towns that stalls in the street contain scarcely any other books than prayer-books, the Following of Christ, the Devout Life, meditations, and lives of saints. It must be allowed that the Spanish are not a reading people as we are; and vast numbers of the poor and middle classes read little else than such works as we have specified. The *Libreria Religiosa*, founded in 1848 by Mgr. Claret, is, however, doing a great work, by providing cheap books of devotion and instruction, as well as Catholic literature generally. The books are sold at cost price. But no country is richer than Spain in old books of piety. The spiritual writers of the Spanish school in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were more numerous than those of Italy or France. There is very little original writing now: the people are satisfied with translations from foreign works, or new editions of their own authors, and the stray old parchment volumes that are to be found in every house.

Devotion to the Immaculate Mother of God, we need not say, is one of the chief characteristics of a country which calls itself with pride "*La tierra de Maria Santisima*." It is affirmed, indeed, that the people received the devotion from the Isidorian school of the seventh century; and it would be an interesting occupation to illustrate at length and in various



detail the earnestness and the enthusiasm they have ever displayed in asserting and defending the doctrine. The way in which the populace in Seville, more than three centuries ago, when grave theologians in the schools thought they discerned reasons for a contrary teaching, took up the cause of the Immaculate Conception, reminds us of the conduct of the Ephesians at the celebrated council of the fifth century. The honour of Mary was vindicated by them with more than the ardour and the prowess of knightly chivalry. The honour of Mary was more sacred, and more precious, and more personal to themselves than that of any other creature. To attack her Immaculate Conception was to wound a "*pundonor*." The whole Spanish nation and its possessions in America were in 1617 placed under the patronage of the Immaculate Conception; and from century to century the voice of Spain was heard clamouring unceasingly for the definition of the doctrine as an article of the faith. Nearly every cathedral in Spain is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin; and in churches in which there are many altars, it is not uncommon to find the greater number of them under her patronage, with statues or pictures above them representing the Immaculate Conception, the Dolours, Our Lady of Carmel, and other titles under which she is invoked. Thus in the church of Santa Maria del Mar, in Barcelona, there are not less than twenty side-chapels dedicated to her honour.

It is not surprising to find that with this great and universal devotion to our Lady, her name should be commonly adopted in baptism. And here is another national peculiarity: the people take her name coupled with that of a mystery, and are called ever afterwards by the mystery which was given them to honour. Thus, Maria de la Concepcion, Maria de la Encarnacion, Maria de la Rosario, Maria de los Dolores, are known respectively as Concepcion, Encarnacion, Rosario, Dolores. And next to this, the most common name is Josefa. Though men are not often called by the name of Mary, they generally have received it in baptism as a second or third name. And as a broad rule, you may say that every woman is Maria Josefa, and every man Jose Maria. The love of Mary has entered into the language of the people, and "*Ave Maria purisima*," to which the reply is "*Sin pecado concebida*," used to be as common a salutation as "*Good day*" or "*How d'ye do*" are in England. And even still it is in common use in the parts where modern ideas have not much penetrated. Everywhere it is a note of exclamation commoner than any other. Nor is this all. The rosary is *par excellence* the devotion of Spain. Everybody, rich or poor, aiming in any

measure at leading a good life, as a matter of course daily says his rosary. On feast-days it is often sung in the church as an evening devotion, and the mysteries are explained from the pulpit; and in every religious family the recital of the rosary, together with the "Bendito," to which we have already referred, forms part of the night prayers. Nor is our Lady's name and invocation confined to the daytime: in many towns, where the Liberal Government of the Revolution did not succeed in enforcing the order which was issued to stop it, the *sereno*, or watchman, in the street prefaces his announcement of the hour of the night and of the weather by the sweet words, "Ave Maria purisima," which he gives out in a plaintive tone. Thus they who in sickness or in trouble lie awake and listen for the passing hours are reminded that they also should raise their hearts to Heaven and say, "Ave Maria purisima!"

We could have wished to dwell upon the universal devotion which exists to S. Joseph. S. Teresa and Suarez succeeded in implanting it so deeply in the hearts of the people that there is not a church in the land without an image or altar of S. Joseph; his feasts are always kept with a Novena or Septena, and the 19th of March is a holiday of obligation. Thus the great devotion of the people may be said to be that to the Holy Family; and by the way we may observe that this devotion is much on the increase amongst ourselves. Nor is it essential either to its idea or its practice that our Lord should always be considered as an infant in the Holy House of Nazareth: as suffering in His Passion, or as hidden in the Blessed Eucharist, He may still be adored as the Child of Mary and Joseph, and as belonging to them by special ties. After this comes devotion to S. Joachim and S. Anne, as being the grandfather and grandmother of our Lord and the parents of our blessed Lady. Perhaps the Venerable Marina de Escobar may be looked upon as the apostle of the devotion to S. Joachim and S. Anne.

We must not omit a few words on the devotion of the Spaniards to the Holy Souls. The late learned and devout Dr. Windischmann, of Munich, was wont to say that a sure test of the Catholic spirit was devotion to our Lady and to the souls in Purgatory; and the Spanish nation bears testimony to the truth of the remark. The deep and fervent charity that burns in its heart not only embraces all the members of the Church on earth, but glows with a like intensity towards the souls of the departed. And so much has this love of the Spaniard for the suffering souls been encouraged by the Holy See, that every priest in Spain has the power of saying three masses on All Souls' Day—a privi-

lege possibly never sought, and certainly not enjoyed, by any other nation. Every year a Novena, which in Spain is equivalent to a mission, takes place in every church for the Holy Souls. It is usual to expose some picture of Purgatory, and the Blessed Virgin is represented above, aiding by her prayers the petitions of the faithful. So universal is this love and tenderness for the suffering souls, that a Protestant writer certainly spoke a Catholic truth, though couched in language of contemptuous scorn, when he said, "More money has been thus spent in masses than would have covered Spain with railroads, even on a British scale of magnificence and extravagance."

The Gospel tells us that love of the poor is a mark of a true Christian. Now, in Spain it may be said that, till a few years ago—that is to say, till the suppression of every monastery in the kingdom—pauperism was unknown. The poor had been so well loved, and were daily so well cared for, in town and country, by the convents, those homes of the people, that a beggar was rarely to be met with. Now all this gospel civilization has been swept away, and men—the men of the revolution—have thought to improve the world by closing all the religious houses and confiscating their property to the State. One of the results is that there is an increasing number of mendicants. But even still there remain abundant traces of the true Catholic spirit, which regards all men as brethren in Christ, and treats poor as well as rich with the respect which is due to the Christian character. It is not that there is no distinction of classes; on the contrary, rank and nobility have always been highly esteemed in Spain. But there is not that separation which prevails in England: there is none of that jealous spirit of isolation which leads men habitually to surround themselves with a cold and repelling atmosphere, as a defence against the too near approach of those whom they do not reckon to belong to their own standing in society. Then, again, that awful gap which separates the acknowledged inferior from his superior in this country is quite unknown in Spain, and indeed, we may say, in any really Catholic country. The Catholic spirit imparts a delicate sense of charity which makes a man sensitively alive to the claims that others have on his respect, prompting him to give honour to whom honour is due, and preserving the superior from arrogance and contempt, and the inferior from servility and flattery. In Spain this Christian habit has been rooted and strengthened by long years of uninterrupted Catholic training. They are a nation of nobles, even to the very beggars.

All, even the poorest, have an innate respect for one another, as they have for themselves. Thus, in speaking to any poor

person, you address him as "usted," or "your mercy," or "caballero;" and they address one another with the same self-restraint and respect. A rich proprietor was going on business to visit his orange-grove. We accompanied him, in order to regale our eyes with the glories of his golden harvest. We asked him a question. He called one of his day labourers to give the answer, and addressed him thus: "If you please, usted (your mercy), how many oranges do these trees bear?" "About four thousand each, your mercy," was the reply, in the very same tone of respect. We stopped to speak to the ploughman, who, with the old Moorish plough, was scratching up the soil among the tenderer plants in the orange-grove. As we left, the familiar expression of the servant to his master was, "Vaya V. con Dios" ("May your mercy depart with God"); to which the natural and beautiful reply was, "Quede V. con Dios" ("And may your mercy remain with God"). This is the usual and familiar expression throughout all classes in Spain. We have often been amused by observing with what ease and confidence a man of the lower classes will stop a gentleman in the road, be it his lordship or his grace, and ask for a light from his cigarette; for here even the beggar who sits at the corner of the street asking alms, manufactures and smokes his cigarette. Nor is the gentleman surprised or offended, but lends his cigarette "with all good grace to grace a gentleman."

This familiarity, these free and easy manners, are accompanied with no vulgarity, nor do they lead to any unbecoming intrusiveness; on the contrary, with admirable tact and delicacy, he who is inferior in station knows how far he may go, and never goes further. Of this we could furnish many instances, did our space permit. If you arrive in a town, and inquire the way to your hotel, or to the museum, or to the church, you will probably be accompanied by the person of whom you have made the inquiry. You beg him not to trouble himself. He assures you that it is a pleasure. You fear you are taking him out of his way. He tells you that it is his way: his way is to be kind and obliging. And if he be a poor man, and you offer him payment, he will be pained that you should suppose he expects remuneration for a simple act of courtesy; the most he would accept would be a cigarette, if you have any.

We have said that long years of Catholic training have imparted to the people a nobility and a mutual respect which does not exist in any country where the Catholic element has not equally prevailed. How touchingly is this exemplified in the way a Spaniard treats the poor mendicant to whom he

refuses an alms. "Brother," he calls him—"brother, for the love of God forgive me." At once he receives a bow, or hears a prayer whispered for him, as though the extended hand had obtained what it asked. To this very day, on the wall of the chief ward in the beautiful hospital of the Caridad, which is served and managed by a brotherhood composed of many of the best families of Seville, we see a list of "the hours at which dinner is served to *our masters and lords the poor*:" then follow the hours. This needs no comment: it speaks the natural feeling of a Catholic people, who regard poverty, not as a thing mean or vile, but as a state that commands respect and deference, a badge of distinction, a patent of high nobility in the kingdom of God. In this hospital none but priests and gentlemen serve the poor at their meals. We visited it in the company of a Spanish nobleman, a senator, and his family; and one of their first acts was to go and kiss reverently the hands of a poor, bed-ridden old man. Even Majesty itself delights to render this homage of Christian love; for when the queen of Spain visited the hospital last year, she went up at once to the old man who had been longest in the house, and respectfully kissed his hands.

The inscription over the door of the Hospital is so strikingly beautiful, and has in it withal so much of the grandeur, pathos, and tender reverence for the poor, characteristic of ancient Spanish piety, that we subjoin a literal rendering of it:—

This work was completed in the year of our salvation 1674—there reigning in heaven our Lord Jesus Christ—He being Supreme Pontiff of the Church, who is High Priest according to the order of Melchisedec—He reigning in the Spains who reigns in heaven—His Divine Majesty being elder brother of this House, and He who thunders in the heavens being a poor brother on these beds,—erected at the cost and expense of the Providence of the Most High God His Father, with whom He lives and reigns in the Unity of the Holy Spirit for ever and ever.\*

We need hardly call our readers' attention to the way in which, instead of the reign of some earthly sovereign, we have the reign in Heaven of our Divine Lord, the Supreme Pontiff of the Church—who yet is the reigning monarch of Spain; and who, in the persons of His representatives the

---

\* Esta obra se acabó año de nuestra Salud de 1674, imperando en el cielo, N.S.J.C., siendo sumo Pontifice de la Iglesia el que es Sumo Sacerdote segun el orden de Melchisedec, reynando en las Españas el que reyna en el cielo, siendo hermano mayor de esta casa Su Divina Magestad y pobre hermano en estas camas el que truena en el cielo—hicieronla a costa y espensas de la Providencia del Muy Alto Dios su Padre, con quien vive y reyna en unidad del Spiritu Santo mas alla de los siglos.

poor, is the elder brother of the house, and is tended, as a sick man, in its beds—"I was sick, and ye visited Me;" nor how, where in this country we should read, "Erected by voluntary contributions," we find the foundation of the institution referred to the Providence of the Most High God. "That Spain—the Spain of that spirit" (writes a Spanish friend in reference to the above inscription), "is so dear to my heart. There is so deep a mine of heroic love of God in our true Spaniards! They seem to feel that, however little we often do, and however great our shortcomings may be, no exuberance of expression, no excess of familiarity that is within the bounds of reverence, is too much in speaking of a God who is—not a great Mechanician, or a great Philosopher—but God that really is, and not a mere logical necessity. In reading that inscription, one feels that these Spaniards, who cannot think of representing our Lord excepting as covered with richest velvet, and gorgeous, yard-deep fringes of true gold, would detect Him at a glance, were He to appear on a sick bed in a hospital, in merest rags. And is not this the sum total of the conception of our Lord by the spiritual mind—to join the highest possible idea of Divine and human grandeur with the apprehension of the very lowest humiliation? After this, does it not follow that the Spaniards of that spirit must, naturally, realize an intense devotion to holy images, and to the Blessed Virgin, and to the Saints, and to the Blessed Sacrament, and to the mystery of the Adorable Trinity? One comprehends it all in a moment—it must so be."

While on this subject, we must not omit a further mention of that brotherhood of charity to which we have just alluded. We mean the *Cofradia de la Caridad*, whose one sole object is "the nursing of the sick by night," and whose very existence bespeaks a tender love of the poor. It may be seen working to perfection in the busy populous town of Barcelona—the Manchester of Spain, as Catalonia is its Lancashire; though the bright sky that overcanopies it, and the blue waters of the Mediterranean that lap its shores, and its cleanly streets and beauteous churches, are in strange and striking contrast with the smoky, murky, saddening Manchester with which we are familiar. Here in this busy mart, when the day is closed, may be seen the middle-class man, the mechanic, the clerk, and even the independent gentleman, looking down a street, perhaps in some forlorn suburb, for the number of the house which has been allotted him as his domicile for the night. He enters in. It contains the little apartment of a sick man, who had been found out by one of the brothers, or who had sent in his name to the office of the confraternity. He is ill, and he knew he would be



cared for, without the pain of leaving his home for the public hospital; and his wife needs rest, for she has been waiting on him all the day. The brother becomes his angel of charity, assists him to pray, and to turn his sufferings to good account; not shrinking from, but rejoicing in, the performance for him of all those offices, however lowly and repulsive, that poor humanity requires in its hour of sickness. He spends the whole night with him, leaving him in the morning to go and hear his mass in a neighbouring church, and then to return to his daily toil or avocation. On the following night the sick man is attended by another of these ministering angels; and so from night to night, until he is either restored to health, or is prepared to make a holy death. This is truly love for the brethren: that they who are at work during the day should gratuitously, and of their own free choice, rob themselves of their night's rest, and impose upon themselves a task irksome, and, it may be, revolting to nature, in order to minister comfort and assistance to some poor and suffering fellow Christian. The custom is truly Spanish; yet, essentially Catholic as it is, might it not become naturalized amongst ourselves?

The nation which gave birth to the order for the Redemption of Captives, and produced a S. John of God, with his mighty heart of charity for the sick and suffering, is still prolific in its inventions of brotherly love. In Barcelona the members of this confraternity amount to several hundreds, and the blessings they disseminate among themselves and the poor are known only to God and His holy angels. Rightly has Spain been styled "most Catholic;" for as it is the country into which the Catholic spirit most deeply penetrated in the ages that are gone for ever, so in these modern times, as we believe, there is none to be compared with it for the tenacity of its faith and the fervour of its charity—its heart is sound and pure, and its instincts are delicate and fine as in the days of its ancient piety.

The Holy Trinity, the Blessed Sacrament, the Passion of our Lord, the Dolours of Mary, her Immaculate Conception, S. Joseph, SS. Joachim and Anne, the Holy Souls, the Poor—these are the salient and marked devotions of the Spanish people. Each would require a separate article were we to do full justice to the deep faith and characteristic piety of this Catholic nation. The limits of a single paper are far too narrow for a picture of ways and habits, which are like the spreading roots of a tree with its delicate fibres, ramifying in all directions, and embracing the whole soil. Spain owes everything to its Catholicity: it is the creation of the Catholic

Church more than any other country. Religion has entered into the character of the people, and woven itself even into their language, in a manner and to a degree that find no parallel in any other nation.

And now we may be asked, is the portrait we have sketched a true representation of the present state of Spain? Is there no radically uncatholic spirit among her politicians, no remissness among her clergy, no neglect of sacraments, no working on Sundays, no ignorance, no religious indifference, among her people? Certainly faults and miseries exist; but we leave to others the task of the scavenger. If they believe that amid the rakings of sin and wretchedness they can find a treasure, let them make the heap and put their hands in it. Our object has been to speak of the actual fruits of Catholicity, not of the products of irreligion; to look upon an example which we may admire and imitate, not upon that which we should detest and shun. Surely the atmosphere in which we live is ungodly, worldly, and noisome enough to make us desire more refreshing scenes, and the taste of something less earthly than those maxims of material prosperity which abound among us.

We may subjoin, however, as a homage to the vitality of the faith and devotion of the Spanish people, and as an account of the difference in religious fervour between the last century and the present, a summary of the evils which have pressed upon the Church in Spain. In another country they would have been sufficient completely to have quenched the light of true religion. At the end of the last century, Regalism, Voltairianism, and Jansenism had taken possession of the court, and held chairs in the universities of Salamanca and Alcalá. Then came the War of Independence: 600,000 French invaders, filled with the spirit of the Revolution, like the foxes of Samson, devastated the country, not only with the flames of war, but with impiety and unbelief. Thousands of simple, faithful Spaniards were sent prisoners to France, whence they returned to their homes, years after, as from a school of immorality and paganism. Next came, in 1809, the suppression by Joseph Bonaparte of all the religious communities: and it must be remembered that in the middle of the last century there were 2,104 houses of men alone (*vide* De la Fuente), numbering at least some 20,000 religious, who were something more than moral police; they were the teachers, pastors, and spiritual fathers of the people.

Then, upon the defeat and expulsion of the invader, were seen the first ripened fruits in Spain of the French school of revolution and infidelity. In 1835 and 1836 above a hundred priests were murdered, the report having been maliciously



spread that the clergy poisoned the drinking waters of the people. Between the years 1835 and 1837 all the monasteries and convents were again suppressed, and this finally; and the whole of their property sold or taken possession of by the Government. Many nuns died of hunger rather than leave their convents. A blow was also struck at the secular clergy. In 1835 a law was passed inhibiting any bishop from conferring Holy Orders and any Spaniard from receiving them: this law remained in force till 1844. In 1841 the property of all the secular clergy, bishops, chapters, and priests, was confiscated to the State. A small stipend was assigned them, wholly inadequate to their support, and often altogether withheld. In 1836 the eight metropolitan archbishops were dead, or in exile; and in 1841, out of nearly eighty episcopal sees scarcely ten had an occupant. To such a length did the evil reach that, in 1842, Señor Alonso brought forward in the Cortes a project of separation from Rome: the Cortes, however, refused to discuss it.

In October, 1844, Queen Isabella II. was declared of age, and from 1845 the Church began to breathe again and to resume her position in the nation. But who does not see, even from this brief summary, through what frightful trials the Church has had to pass for the space of seventy or eighty years? The wonder is, not that the spirit of religion is impaired, but that any has survived.

The material future of Spain may be confidently predicted: it must be prosperous; her natural resources are being for the first time opened out. Her religious future is not yet clear. The Church has been persecuted, injured, and maimed: her religious orders are still proscribed—she is therefore still in bondage. She is like an army in the field without auxiliaries—might we not add without cavalry and artillery? Her enemies are those of the century—impiety and revolution, which are widely spread, and are almost identical with democracy and modern liberalism. They have strongholds in Gibraltar and elsewhere; so much so, that we might well devote an entire article to the present active machinations and influence of English Protestantism in Spain, which is synonymous with revolution and impiety. Another remark we will hazard: In Spain the Government is what is called Constitutional; it is, however, but a poor, empty mockery of what we understand by constitutional government. Practically it is little better than a means whereby a few daring spirits, whose last thoughts are the spiritual or moral benefit of the country, are able to enact anti-Catholic laws and to impose them upon the nation. The nation at large takes no part in the constitution; it is worked

by the few. If the good would but use their political power, they might carry everything before them, and Spain might again present an example of a nation at once most Catholic and most prosperous ; but the good, although the majority, do not rise up and take their place and assert their rights. The people have from generation to generation been trained in the practice of submission to authority. The habit of obedience has become a portion of their moral nature ; and they have not yet taken in the idea of the principle upon which constitutional government is grounded—each power in the State acting as a check and counterpoise to the others ; the people meanwhile yielding but a bare obedience to the party which for the time being is in the ascendancy. The very machinery which the carrying out of this principle involves, helps to discredit it in their eyes. Struggle, agitation, canvassing at elections, continual political contest—these things never used to be called honourable, or useful, or virtuous, and the people are slow to understand how of a sudden, within a few years, they should have become, not only desirable, but laudable. In short, their traditions and their habits for centuries have been diametrically opposed to the whole spirit and action of constitutional government ; and as yet they neither perceive the duties, nor do they avail themselves of the power and the rights, consequent on the position which a new form of government has created. But this is not quite the whole account of the reason why the few are able to lord it over the many, and why the wicked triumph and the good succumb. The effrontery and boldness of vice are greater than the independence and courage of virtue, unless virtue has risen above the mean. There is nothing more lamentable than to see how the wicked few, as in Italy so in Spain, parade the standard of their own ungodliness and live up boldly to it in word and work, and how the good, though numerically superior, too often not only shrink back and hide themselves, as though they were ashamed of their own goodness, but even refuse boldly to unfurl the banner of the Cross of Christ. Sometimes in good faith, as if it were the only course left to them, sometimes from timidity, they disappear altogether from the scene, or they sue for peace, as if powerless to offer any effectual resistance—contenting themselves with exclaiming that the world is growing more and more evil, and misfortunes are coming upon them such as their fathers had never to endure. There is, however, a growing party in the country, including a small band of senators and deputies, who are manfully using their rights in the right cause, and are endeavouring to teach the multitude that new duties have fallen upon them, and that they must fulfil them,

if they love their country, and desire that religion should flourish as heretofore, and that God's honour should no longer be trampled on in Spain. May this small though noble company increase and multiply ! May they enlighten the eyes and strengthen the hands of their fellow-countrymen !

Will, then, the Church, crippled as she has been, and still is, be equal to her task ? We are no prophets. We believe in her innate power : will this power be appreciated and duly used ? The future will decide. We may note, however, as among the encouraging signs of the times,—1st, that the influence of the court, since the present universally esteemed saintly prelate has been its spiritual director, has been worthy of Spain's most Catholic days ; and that the queen is openly and avowedly pious, and devoted to the Church. 2nd, that a wonderful change has taken place in the higher ranks. A generation or two back the ideas of the Encyclopædia were a passport to society ; now they are an absolute bar to an entrance into it. Then, 3rd, as to the multitude, the best informed assert that, were the convents to be re-opened, they would at once be replenished again with abundant vocations. 4th, that nothing can exceed the simple faith and piety to be found in the small country towns and villages. If a priest goes to the church and rings the bell, the building is at once filled to hear him preach ; and it is a people most easily melted to contrition, and moved to make a full and sincere confession. When a retreat or mission is given, there is scarcely a man or woman in the place who does not attend and profit by it. We have known most touching examples of the effect of missions and retreats. There is no want of faith, no hardness of heart, none of that stolid indifference among the poor country people which we are familiar with in what are called more civilized countries. Missions, however, unfortunately, are comparatively rare, because the religious orders are destroyed. 5th,—and this is the most hopeful sign of all,—the ecclesiastical seminaries, those seed-plots of the Church, are increasing in number and efficiency ; the bishops watching over them with the tenderest care. The bishops themselves are well chosen, and are excellent men, thanks to the pious zeal and conscientiousness of the queen,—not of her ministers of State. Lastly, the Holy See—to which the Church of Spain has always been most loyally and conspicuously devoted—in the Concordat of 1851, obtained a pledge from the Government to exclude from the Spanish dominions every other form of religion but that of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman (*vide* 1st article of Concordat). We mention these points, not by way of discussion or as exhausting the subject, but as testifying to the deep impression which

the Catholic faith has made on the Spanish people, so that not the waters of many years of suffering and impiety have been able to efface it.

The following passage is so much to the point that we think we do well to transcribe it. The writer, as a Protestant, confounds the obedience rendered to the divine authority of the Church with "a blind submission to priestly authority," and, as an American citizen, identifies the honour paid to rulers and superiors with "loyalty to mere rank and place;" but his testimony to the sterling qualities of the Spanish people is not the less valuable on that account; perhaps only the more so. "The law of progress is on Spain for good or for evil, as it is on the other nations of the earth; and her destiny, like theirs, is in the hand of God, and will be fulfilled. The material resources of her soil and position are as great as those of any people that now occupies its meted portion of the globe. The mass of her inhabitants, and especially of her peasants, has been less changed, and in many respects less corrupted, by the revolutions of the last century, than any of the nations who have pressed her borders, or contended with her power. They are the same race of men who twice drove back the Crescent from the shores of Europe, and twice saved from shipwreck the great cause of Christian civilization. They have shown the same spirit at Saragossa that they showed two thousand years before at Saguntum. They are not a ruined people. And while they preserve the sense of honour, the sincerity, and the contempt for what is sordid and base, that have so long distinguished their national character, they cannot be ruined."—*Ticknor's "History of Spanish Literature,"* vol. iii. p. 323.

With respect to the custom of dancing before the Blessed Sacrament (alluded to at p. 11), we have received the following additional particulars since the article was in type: "*Within* the church there is the dance at the Christmas midnight Mass, in the Cathedral of Seville. It is performed by six little choir-boys in the sanctuary, and is called *de los Seises*. *Outside* the church you have dancing at any village procession of Corpus Christi, by some graceful lads, castanet in hand, who keep carefully a backward step. Occasionally a few girls will take their place to sing a *loa* of praise and triumph (in the same position), at intervals in the procession. The "*Pange Lingua*" is sung by all present, alternating with the dance, until they return to the porch of the church, when the hymn alone is heard. The same thing occurs in the processions of August 15th, September 8th, and December 8th, before the image of the Blessed Virgin, when it is carried beyond the church door with cross, banner, and canopy. On all such occasions a play is acted in the afternoon, in the open air, by the youthful performers, which is succeeded by a general dance."

## ART. II.—THE ABYSSINIAN SCHISM.

1. *Ludolfi Historia Æthiopica*. Francofurti ad Mænum. 1681.
2. *Bruce's Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile*. 5 vols. Edinburgh, 1790.
3. *The Highlands of Æthiopia*. By Major HARRIS. 3 vols. London : Longmans. 1844.
4. *Life in Abyssinia*. By Mansfield Parkyns. 2 vols. London : J. Murray. 1853.
5. *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours in Eastern Africa*. By the Rev. Dr. Krapf. London : Trübner & Co. 1860.
6. *Wanderings among the Fálashas of Abyssinia*. By Rev. H. Stern. London : Wertheim, Macintosh, & Hunt. 1862.

**A**MONG the primitive schisms and heresies which have existed, age after age, in a sort of petrified state, in the wide regions of the East, the Abyssinian state Church holds a singular place. It deserves our attention on several grounds : for example, as a disfigured relic of the missionary successes of the Catholic Church in the important times of S. Athanasius ; as a Christian community still exhibiting that admixture of Judaism which turns us back in thought to the earliest Christian converts and their peculiar difficulties, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles ; as an involuntary witness to the Catholic Church, on the one hand, by its even exaggerated admission of certain practices alleged by Protestants to be only innovations of Rome, and on the other, by the vague and contradictory character of its doctrines, accounted for by its long-continued separation from the supreme authority of Catholic truth ; finally, as the religious organization of a barbarous people, who are both physically and politically of much interest to the student of history—in the former respect, as holding, in an ethnological point of view, a sort of midway position between the Caucasian and Negro races ; in the latter, as affording the solitary instance in Africa of a degree of civilization that exceeds the savage culture of kingdoms like Dahomey. The Abyssinians probably have been a nation of much higher rank than they are at present : they possess regular institutions modelled on the Christian type, however debased ; and they have a literature apparently much resembling that of the earlier mediæval period of Europe, and a learned class possessed of a cultivation not despicable, considering their opportunities.

So that we may safely predict at least this much, that if Africa, as many well-informed thinkers believe, is one day to be raised from the degradation in which it has grovelled throughout so many ages, Abyssinia is destined to play some great part in such restoration. If we add to all this, the history of its civil revolutions, highly curious as those of an empire in much the state of the early times of Saxon England; its reconstruction, in our days, we may almost say, whilst we write, by a barbarian conqueror of great ability, Kasai, or Theodorus, whose name scarcely reached Europe amidst the tumult of our own Russian war; the heroic efforts of the Society of Jesus in the seventeenth century to reclaim this fallen Church, then but just becoming known to Europe, which had hitherto heard of it only as the mythical kingdom of Prester John; the repeated exertions of late years made by Mgr. de Jacobis and his illustrious companions for the same object, ending alike in their sufferings and expulsion, as though individuals only, and not whole communities, as a general rule, are permitted the grace of being converted from schism,—if, we say, these fields of inquiry be added to the foregoing, the reader will perceive that the whole subject is not only one of unusual interest, but that, in order to its just treatment, we cannot include in the compass allotted to an article more than a limited portion of the entire discussion. What we propose, therefore, to confine ourselves to at present is the constitution, doctrine, and ceremonies of the Abyssinian Church, premising some account of the early relations of the Abyssinian people to the Jewish nation, and of their conversion in the fourth century.

The sources of our information are chiefly the great work of Ludolf; the modern travellers in Abyssinia, such as Bruce, and, in our own times, Harris, Parkyns, Krapf, and Stern; the letters relating to Mgr. Massaia's and Mgr. de Jacobis' mission in the "*Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*," and some MS. letters from a native Abyssinian priest, written from the country in the years 1853-55, and kindly communicated to us by the respected ecclesiastic to whom, then at Rome, they were addressed.

Abyssinia, in classical and ecclesiastical language *Æthiopia*, called by its inhabitants *Hâbesh*, is an extensive region of somewhat undefined limits, stretching from Sennaar and Tâka north to beyond the Galla countries on the south, and from the White Nile to the Red Sea east and west. It formed for many ages one empire under sovereigns claiming descent from Menilek, son of the queen of Saba (or Sheba, to use the name more familiar to English literature) by Solomon, and called by the title of Negus. But from the sixteenth century this empire



was broken up by invasion and intestine disorders into three great divisions, Amhàra, Tigrè, and Shoa, each under its own rulers, though paying an empty deference to the shadowy representative of the line of Solomon, who still remained at Gondar, as he does even now, like the king of Delhi under British dominion till the times of the Indian mutiny. As we said above, the whole or almost the whole of the ancient empire of Abyssinia has lately been reunited by a successful adventurer, who has caused himself to be anointed emperor by the Abuna, or Metropolitan of Abyssinia, of whose office we shall have much to say further on. The legend of the connection of ancient Æthiopia with Judæa is worth relating, however mixed up with fable. It is recorded in the ancient chronicle, entitled *Kebir Za Negust*, or "Glory of the Kings" (Mr. Parkyns thinks the rendering should rather be "Deeds of the Kings"), annals of which the historical value for early times is certainly not great, since they declare that the world was divided by direct inheritance from Adam into the two great empires of Ittopia and Romia, the former possessing all regions to the south of Jerusalem, the latter all the north. According to this authority, Maqueda, Queen of Æthiopia, having heard from the merchant Tamerin of the wisdom of King Solomon, undertook a visit to him, and remained for a time in the land of Israel. On her return, she bore a son to the Jewish monarch, whom she called Menilek, and who was afterwards sent to be educated at the court of his father. When he had grown up, he came back to Æthiopia, attended by Hebrew nobles from every tribe, and a body of elders under Azarias, son of Zadok, the high-priest, and carrying with him the ark of the covenant and the tables of the law, which he had, by a pious theft, taken out of the temple, the doors of it having been miraculously opened for that purpose. The ark is believed by the Abyssinians to be preserved in the celebrated church of Axum, called Hedar Tsion, under the custody of an officer called Nabrid. The Queen of Saba resigned the throne in favour of her son, and at her death ordained that no female should in future sway the Æthiopian sceptre, and that the princes not succeeding to the throne should be kept prisoners in a mountain fortress, an institution actually observed for ages in Abyssinia, and which has supplied the idea of the beautiful romance of "Rasselas," which, however, gives a picture of splendid captivity little resembling the reality of the *duressse* to which these unfortunate descendants of royalty were subjected.

The line of Menilek held the dominion over Æthiopia undisturbed till the year A.D. 960, when it sustained a rude shock from the Jewish population themselves, who had sprung from



the settlers sent forth in the time of Solomon. These people, called Fálashas, had become very powerful, and when the Abyssinian emperors accepted Christianity in the fourth century, they refused to give up their national faith, elected a Hebrew sovereign, and seized the mountain fastnesses of Simien and Bellesa, where for several centuries they abode under kings and queens called invariably Gideon and Judith. In the middle of the tenth century, a princess of this race, called Esther (by the Amhara, Issat, signifying "fire"), a heroine of daring and unscrupulous character, seized the opportunity of an epidemic which had carried off the emperor and weakened Abyssinia, to surprise the rock Damo, where the captive princes of the royal house resided, massacred them all, and proclaimed herself queen. The infant successor to the imperial throne, however, was saved, and escaped into Shoa, with which fragment of the old empire his descendants were contented for many generations, whilst the dominion over the rest of Abyssinia passed after a time into the hands of a Christian family. In the thirteenth century, the representative of this family was induced by Tekla Haimanot, the most celebrated of the saints of the Abyssinian schism, to resign in favour of the then chief of the house of Menilek, who transmitted the power as well as the title of Negus of Abyssinia to his successors until the disruption of the empire to which we have adverted, and to enter into details of which is beyond the design of the present article. The arrangement made by Tekla Haimanot included stipulations affecting the Church, which we shall afterwards notice. It is called in Abyssinian history, "The Era of Partition." The Fálashas maintained an independent existence under their own princes until the beginning of the seventeenth century, but were at length driven out of their mountain district, and scattered through the Amhara, where they are still found living in their separate villages in the provinces of Dunbea, Quara, Woggera, Tschelga, and Godjam. They form a very remarkable fragment of the Jewish people, and their presence derives the greater attraction from the striking Jewish features which the Christianity of the Abyssinian schism presents.

The conversion of Abyssinia to Christianity, according to a general and credible tradition, commenced in the year 330, and was brought about in the following way: Meropius, a Tyrian merchant, landed on the Æthiopian coast on his way to India, and was murdered by the natives, who made slaves of his two sons, Frumentius and Edesius. These captives were brought to the court of the emperor, where their abilities and discretion gave them a prevailing influence, which enabled them ere long

to induce the monarch to embrace Christianity, and by his example to lead a great number of his subjects in the same direction. As soon as these happy results were brought about, Frumentius proceeded to Alexandria to report the victories of the cross, and to receive advice and aid from S. Athanasius, who at that time sat on the patriarchal throne of S. Mark. The heroic champion of orthodoxy joyfully received the humble missionary, who had achieved such glories in an untrodden field, consecrated him bishop of the region which he had won to the faith, and again sent him forth to consolidate the conquest so happily commenced. To this day, the Church of Abyssinia, now, alas, immersed both in schism and heresy, pays to Frumentius (under the name of Abba Salama) the same honours which England owes to her Augustine, and Ireland to her Patrick. The following passages from the *Encomia*, used in the Abyssinian churches, will witness to the devotion which has survived even the apostasy of so many centuries :—

I bid hail to him with the voice of gladness,  
Magnifying and extolling him ;  
Salama, the door of mercy and clemency,  
Who caused the splendour of the light of Christ to arise in Æthiopia,  
When (aforetime) there had been in it clouds and darkness.

And again :—

I bid thee hail, Salama, who wast commanded  
To manifest the hidden doctrine ;  
For it rose in Æthiopia, like the morning star.  
By thy holy light and pleasant beauty  
Even unto this day Æthiopia rejoices and is glad.

In the next century a great number of missionaries flocked into Æthiopia from the Oriental Churches. The statement of the chronicle of Axum is that "very many monks came from Rome" (meaning, most probably, by this the Roman Empire) "and filled the whole kingdom." Among these great names, forgotten in the western world, nine are held in special reverence by the Abyssinians—the Abba Aragawi, Pantaleon, Garima, Alif, Sakam, Aflo, Likanos, Adimatus, and Og. Miracles of a stupendous kind are freely ascribed to them, such as moving mountains, quieting stormy seas, and raising the dead. In some of the features of Abyssinian hagiology there is a character of grotesque wildness, which must be noticed in forming a judgment of the nature of their popular belief. Thus Samuel, one of their saints, rides upon a lion ; and in the life of Tekla Haimanot, the great monastic hero of mediæval

Æthiopia (if we may use that epithet in speaking of a country whose history has never passed out of the period which answers to it), we read of evil-minded monks cutting the rope by which the saint was being drawn up the precipitous rock of Debra Damo, whereupon six wings immediately sprout from his body and bear him in safety to the summit. Whilst we admit that incidents almost as marvellous might be quoted from Catholic legends, and whilst we place no limits to the extent and manner of operation of supernatural power, the miracles authenticated by authority in the Catholic Church have, nevertheless, on the whole, a certain gravity which is far indeed from appearing in the religious chronicles of a nation at once heretical and barbarous.

Abyssinia, though so easily and prosperously converted to the Catholic faith, remained obedient to it for little more than a century. In the great Monophysite controversy, which was settled at the council of Chalcedon in 451, she rejected the authoritative decision of the Church, and has ever since been ranked among the Monophysite communities. There is no doubt that practically this is what the Abyssinian position comes to, but it will be instructive to examine how it was brought about, and what defence is alleged by the Abyssinians themselves for their own conclusions.

The heresy of Eutyches carried him into a direction the exact opposite of the previous heresy of Nestorius. The one had maintained that there were two persons in Christ, a divine and a human; the other was so far from admitting a duality of persons, that he even denied a duality of natures; and, whilst admitting that two distinct natures were really united, he contended that the union itself obliterated all distinction between them; the divinity so absorbing the humanity that the latter was lost and disappeared in its immensity. Hence he denied that our Lord's body was of the same substance as ours. Eutyches having been condemned and deprived by a synod held at Constantinople, appealed to the emperor Theodosius: another council was held at Ephesus, under the presidency of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, which was characterized by such outrages, that it goes, as is well known, under the name of the *Latrocinium*, or "Robbers' gang." Dioscorus refused to allow a letter of Pope Leo to be presented to the council, had even the temerity to excommunicate him, obtained the signatures of the assembled bishops to a blank document, and by such means, and by violence, in consequence of which S. Flavian lost his life, succeeded in getting the deprivation of Eutyches revoked. It was not to be expected that matters could be allowed to rest there. At the council of Chalcedon—thanks principally to the firmness of the Papal

legates, the Catholic doctrine was set forth with the utmost clearness, and those were anathematized who held a resclution into one, of our Lord's two natures. It was declared that the difference of the natures was in no way annulled by their union, but the peculiar essence of each was preserved in one person and one subsistence—not as though they were severed into two persons, but existing in one and the same only-begotten Son, the Divine Word, Jesus Christ. This definition therefore both re-affirmed the previous condemnation of Nestorius, whom the Eutychians pretended that the Catholic doctrine would favour, and censured their own error, which, though in another direction, struck equally at our belief in the Incarnation. Dioscorus, though thrice cited to appear before the council, refused to come, and for this reason, as well as because he had ventured to excommunicate Pope Leo, was deprived by the council of his episcopal dignity, and removed from all priestly functions. Both he and Eutyches were banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia.

What the views of Dioscorus were, is not very clear. He was not personally condemned on a point of faith, but for his insolence to the Holy See, and for his contumacy in refusing to appear before the council. He seems, however, to have adopted a middle course—to have flinched from maintaining with his friend Eutyches that the humanity disappeared after the union—but to have held that Christ was *from* two natures, whilst he would not declare that there were two natures *in* Christ. He probably bore the same relation to the downright Eutychians, that Anglicanism does to the decided Protestantism that surrounds it. And just as Anglicanism shrinks from identifying itself positively with those to whom its attractions necessarily lead it, so to this day the Abyssinians refuse to be called Monophysites, whilst all but themselves can see that the distinctions which separate them do not constitute a difference. We are told by Bruce, a traveller, who, though a Protestant, had evidently a mind naturally well adapted for theological discussions, that scarce any would suffer it to be said that Christ's body was perfectly like ours, and that it was easily seen that in their hearts they were very loth to believe, if they did believe it at all, that the body of the Virgin Mary and S. Anne were perfectly human.\*

What they allege about Dioscorus is this: that he had complained heavily of being wronged, that he had not followed Eutyches, or denied or confounded the divinity or humanity of Christ; but had only refused to acknowledge the word *Nature*,

---

\* Bruce's Travels, book v. chap. xii.

as common to the divinity and humanity, and only taught that two persons should not be asserted in Christ, contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church and to the council of Ephesus, which he insisted would follow if we admitted two natures and two wills in Him. They contend that the word Nature means something created; that two wills are inconceivable, and that human nature in glory has no difference in will from the Divine. We here remark the self-will and inconsistency of heresy. The same people who already accepted the word Person in speaking of the Blessed Trinity, hesitated at a word not at all more open to the metaphysical objections to which all language is liable when endeavouring to express ideas which appertain to the Divine. It is also instructive to observe that the Eutychians, just like those who apostatized from the Catholic Church on such widely different grounds more than a thousand years later, appealed against her views to the supposed doctrines of the past, charging her with innovation. That past was imaginary, in any sense that would have assisted their argument. The saints and doctors who lived in it were prepared to accept the judgment of the Church on any point of controversy whenever it should be issued, and already held, by implication, all future definitions. The expressions of the earlier Fathers, on which Eutyches relied, would at once have been withdrawn by them, had it then been apparent that the mind of the Church, always the same, though not always by all persons equally understood, required a different formula for its complete declaration upon any point. To resume: whatever is to be thought of the tradition of the Æthiopians about the defence of Dioscorus, there is no doubt that they eagerly followed in the wake of their mother Church of Egypt, whose army of fanatical monks had formed the strength of its unscrupulous leader at Ephesus. They called the council of Chalcedon a "council of fools," and styled the Catholics Chalcedonians, just as Anglicans have styled Catholics of the present day Tridentines.

The heresiarch Dioscorus is enrolled among the saints of the Abyssinian calendar, has more than one festival in his honour, and is thus celebrated in the Abyssinian hymnology:—

Hail to Dioscorus, who laughed to scorn the religion [of the king],\*

Whilst he (the king) divided the unity of God and man.

That he might strengthen those who were there, the disciples of his religion.  
The hairs which had been torn from his beard, and those of his teeth which  
had been knocked out,

As the fruit of his faith, he sent into a distant region.

---

\* The Catholic religion was thus styled by the heretics, because it was supported at the time by the Imperial authority. The term "Melchites," (from the Hebrew for a king) was similarly applied to the Catholics.

Ecclesiastical history tells us that Dioscorus was not present at the council, and makes no mention of this tale of violence. We are tempted to think that by a sort of mythical inversion the heresiarch is here described as the victim of the very outrages which he or his partizans had inflicted upon S. Flavian. From this epoch, the Church of Æthiopia of course is to be regarded as a branch severed from the true vine, and left to itself. All branches when parted from their parent stock, either wither or exhibit only the false vitality of rottenness. The latter seems most conspicuous in the schism we now contemplate. Whilst they keep up, age after age, customs which are partly abuses, partly compliances only permitted in the infancy of the Church; whilst they look back with a dull, uniform gaze to a remote period, since which the Catholic Church, under the rule of the successors of S. Peter, has run such a giant's course, the Abyssinians are nevertheless agitated by restless controversies, which keep them incessantly in motion, but without progression. We shall presently consider, in greater detail, the nature of these disputes; but it appears proper first to place before the reader an account of the constitution of the Abyssinian Church, now that we have seen it come into separate existence by its act of apostasy in the fifth century.

The chief ecclesiastical ruler of the Abyssinians is the *Abuna*, or primate. This dignitary, whose title signifies "Father," is claimed, on the authority of apocryphal canons of the council of Nice, to have held, in the early Church, the seventh place in councils held in Greece, next after the prelate of Seleucia. Since 1282, the time of Tekla Haimanot, he has always been nominated by the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria. His duty is to ordain priests and deacons, to consecrate the king, to bless the ark—an object of religious reverence in churches which the Abyssinians have borrowed from Judaism; and generally to govern the Church, in which office he is associated with the *Ëtchequé*—the superior, or, as we should call him, father-general of all the monks in Abyssinia. The Abuna is held in profound reverence by the people, who, as he travels, prostrate themselves before him in the dust; and he is described, when granting interviews to Europeans, as surrounded with a good deal of barbaric display, seated in a scarlet-covered chair, and wrapped up in silks. He has, in various ways, very considerable power. For example, all matters of dispute in which ecclesiastics are concerned, are referred to his adjudication; public confession of grave offences is made to him, and he assigns penances, occasionally of a magnitude resembling those we read of in the primitive ages; he also has the authority to restrain, by severe penalties, what it pleases him to con-



demn as heresy. To him is referred, by the king, the question of allowing or prohibiting the residence of strangers who come to Abyssinia for religious purposes; his displeasure has been a principal cause of the expulsion of Catholic missionaries, and his favour has enabled Anglicans to settle in the country. The present Abuna, the Abba Salama, was educated at Cairo, in the Church of England School kept by Mr. Lieder, one of the German missionaries connected with the Anglican establishment; and the effect of his early training is apparent in his whole policy. Strictly speaking, the Abuna appears to be the only bishop recognized by the Abyssinians in the country. There is, indeed, another officer called the *Comus*, a title which is usually rendered bishop; but although he ranks next above the priests, his position is evidently not episcopal, for he has neither diocese nor jurisdiction over the clergy; his duties (if Major Harris was rightly informed), being simply to bless and purify the arks if defiled by the touch of deacon or layman (when a Mahometan has touched one, the purification is reserved to the Abuna himself); to repeat the prayer of admission, and to sign the cross on the skull-cap of persons admitted to the monastic vows. Priests are ordained by the Abuna, by the ceremony of breathing upon them, and as it is generally impossible, in consequence of the ignorance and carelessness of the Abyssinians, to ascertain the age of candidates, it is merely required, as a proof of the due age having been attained, that the beard shall have appeared. As regards education, candidates for the priesthood must be able to read, to repeat the Nicene Creed, and possess by heart the psalms and the Abyssinian hymnarium. Their duties are to baptize, to administer the Holy Eucharist, and to sing the litanies. Like the priests of the Greek Church, they may not marry after ordination. Deacons are chosen from among very young persons, the corruption of manners, common in Abyssinia, making it believed that the requisite purity is not to be expected among candidates of a more advanced age. They act as acolytes, and are alone permitted to bake the bread which is used in the celebration of the Eucharist. For this purpose there is attached to each church a small edifice called the Bethlehem. Sub-deacons are also named among the clergy.

The revenues of the churches are managed by a lay officer called the *Alaka*, and named by the king. He might be compared to the *Vidame*, or lay-noble who, in mediæval Europe, used to be chosen by monasteries to protect their secular interests. Till recently, a third of the Abyssinian territory was in the hands of the clergy, and untaxed; but under the rule of the present king Theodorus, a great change has been effected in



this respect. He issued an edict sequestering the whole of the church property, and appointing for each church two priests and three deacons, with small tracts of land. The opposition made to this spoliation was so great that he was compelled to reserve the execution for a time, but it came into force in 1860.

Monks are very numerous in Abyssinia, but they are on a completely different footing from religious in the Catholic Church. In the first place, they do not live in monasteries, but each in his hut, round a church in an enclosed village. They may cultivate farms, exercise civil functions, and go about where they like, being, in fact, hardly distinguishable from laymen except for their *schema* (a sort of scapular) and cross. They therefore, perhaps, resemble the tertiaries of some orders or monastic institutions in their most primitive forms, like the Essenes. In these, as in many other features of the Abyssinian and Greek schisms, we behold very early characteristics of Christian society, fixed as though by a frost. Catholicism has grown and put forth leaves; they retain their unnatural aspect of a stationary infancy. Each monastic society is independent of the rest, and under its own abbot, yet all appear to be under the general control of the *Etchequé*. This dignitary more especially presides over the monks of Debra Libanos. Another class are called the monks of S. Eustathius, and are governed by the superior of the convent of Mahebar Selsasse, in the north-west corner of Abyssinia. There are also convents of nuns.

Next after the clergy and monks, we should mention a remarkable class in Abyssinia, the *debterahs*. They answer to the scribes in the Jewish church, and are the learned order, but do not receive ordination, nor are considered as clerics, though no religious ceremony is complete without their presence. Protestant travellers speak in very indifferent terms of their moral character, as they do of the Abyssinians generally. We read, however, with pleasure, in a letter of Mgr. de Jacobis,\* a much kinder estimate of these depositaries of the learning of a barbarous but interesting country. According to his account, all the education in Abyssinia is furnished by the Church, and what we should call schools and colleges are attached to some religious foundation, and never superintended by laymen. The teachers are generally, he says, priests or monks, and where such are not to be had, simple *debterahs*, or laureat-masters, appointed by the emperor. This may not be inconsistent with the latter being regarded as the learned class, any more than in European countries, where education has often been controlled by ecclesiastics, whilst the literary order, though not

---

\* Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, vol. xii. p. 345.

regularly organized, has been distinct from the Church. In describing the habits of life by which such education as Abyssinia can give is obtained, we are reminded of the "hedge-schools" of Ireland, where so much sound knowledge was painfully and generously learned before the revolution effected by the national system. The teachers, it appears, are miserably paid in Abyssinia. Their remuneration reminds us of the *diarium* of a Roman slave. They receive twenty-four measures of corn per annum, weighing about fifty pounds, and four *amulié*, a small coin equal to about two shillings of our money. But poor as the material reward of learning may be, the love of it, for its own sake, is such, that an Abyssinian student will cheerfully leave his family with a bag of dried peas on his shoulder, and beg when it is exhausted. He acts as the servant of his teacher, like the scholars of mediæval Oxford, and in return for these sacrifices is trained, for what seems a lifetime, in the circle of Æthiopian science. Seven years are devoted to the *Ziema*, or church-music; nine years to *Suasuo*, or grammar; four to *Chanien*, or poetry; ten to the *Chedusan-Metzahft*, or sacred books of the Old and New Testaments. We are not informed how far these courses are carried on simultaneously. Civil and canon law, astronomy and history, form a higher course, which is attempted by but few students. Mgr. de Jacobis estimates the value of this system as follows:—

In reality, all this labour gives little knowledge, always excepting the study of the Holy Scriptures, which supplies to the heart its noble inspirations, to the mind its luminous guidance, and to all the social relations of life its justice, delicacy, and charity. In this respect, a simple *deberah* of Abyssinia is greatly superior to many European scholars.\*

They include in the canons of the Old Testament the various books treated by the Protestants as apocryphal. On the other hand they include in the New Testament a collection called *Synodus*, which contains the apostolic constitutions and Clementine canons, though with a good deal of variation. These they regard as absolutely of the same authority as the writings of the apostles and evangelists. Next in reverence to these they hold the acts of the general councils preceding that which dates their apostasy; viz., Nice (the first), Constantinople (the first), and Ephesus; besides those of certain provincial councils, Ancyra, Cæsarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, and Sardis.

The Abyssinians hold with the Greek schism, the heresy that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only. Ludolf, it is true, says, and we can well believe him, that the Abba

\* Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, vol. xii. pp. 345-6.

Gregorius told him that the Abyssinians do hold that the Holy Ghost is equally of the Father and of the Son, but that they reject the term "proceeding;" and when asked by the historian to account for this circumstance, the Abyssinian ecclesiastic asked him first to explain what he meant by "proceeding," and insisted on sticking, in this matter, to the very words of Scripture. In the same spirit, a prelate of the Anglican Church, quoting certain terms in reference to the Blessed Trinity, which the more learned and orthodox of the Protestants have retained from Catholic theology, asks, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" \* What result comes of this presumptuous rejection of the words by which the Catholic Church has at once expressed and fortified the most necessary doctrine, may be judged of by the confusion into which these scrupulous Abyssinian divines have fallen, in course of time, on the doctrines for which they profess such reverence. The Anglo-German missionary Krapf, who is not likely on such a point to bear false testimony against them, tells us that in the Abyssinian theology "in the presence of the Father, [the Son] recedes into the background, just as before the Father and the Son the Holy Ghost dwindles almost into nothingness" (p. 39). We here, to say the least of it, observe something of the darkness of Judaism, as in so many other features of the Abyssinian system. And by way of showing the tendencies of thought among the people on this subject, we may here notice an old Abyssinian heresy, that of Tzagazaaba, mentioned by Ludolf, who maintained that Christ was Son of Himself, and *ἄρχή* of Himself.

At the present day the Abyssinian Church is torn in pieces by controversies concerning a branch of the doctrine of the Incarnation. It would appear from a catechism written out for Ludolf in the seventeenth century by the above-named Gregorius that they had always placed in some prominence "the two nativities of Christ," viz., the first, as they expressed it, "by His Father, without mother, and without time;" the second, "by the Virgin Mary, our Lady, without father, and in time." It must also be mentioned, in order to understand the spirit of the Abyssinian Church on this head, that, in common with all the Eastern Churches, they make very much of the mystery of our Lord's baptism in the Jordan, their celebration of which we shall have occasion to notice further on. Now, about sixty years ago, there arose a monk at Gondar, who promulgated a doctrine commonly styled "the three births." As stated by Krapf, the dispute is as follows:—

---

\* Whately's "Logic," App. art. "Person."

The dogma of the three births . . . consists in the assertion that the baptism or consecration of Christ with the Holy Ghost in the river Jordan constituted His third birth. According to some, the Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds (first birth), became man in time (second birth); but, according to others, Christ in the Virgin's womb was already anointed, prayed, fasted, and so forth. And this they call His third birth.

Major Harris, though a soldier, has given a more compact statement of the question. He says:—

At the expense of a bloody civil war, Gondar, with Gojam, Damet, and all the south-western provinces of Amhára, has long maintained the three births of Christ—Christ proceeding from His Father from all eternity, styled “the eternal birth;” His incarnation, as being born of the Holy Virgin, termed His “second or temporal birth;” and His reception of the Holy Ghost in the womb, denominated His “third birth.”—(vol. iii. p. 186.)

But the correspondence of a native Catholic priest of Abyssinia, to which we have already referred, enables us to perceive much more clearly than hitherto the nature and bearings of this remarkable controversy in the heretical Church of these remote latitudes of Africa. The letter which we proceed to quote bears date the 29th May, 1855. It is written in Italian, with the exception of a portion in Latin which we lay before the reader as it stands, subjoining also a translation:—

You must know that all the schismatics of Abyssinia are divided into three classes, and those of one class cannot communicate with those of another. These are, the *Tanahide*, which signifies Union; the *Kabat*, which is Unction; and the *Segga Lege*, which is the Son of Grace; so that one may call these the Unionists, Unctionists, Gratians, or better, Adoptionists. The question which divides them consists in this: viz., *Utrum Christus, ut homo, fit filius Dei naturalis per unionem hypostaticam, an per gratiam unionis, an per unctionem Spiritus Sancti, an per gratiam habitualement*? *Primæ classis dicunt, per unionem hypostaticam tantum independentem ab unctione Spiritus Sancti, immo excludunt et rejiciunt gratiam habitualement tanquam superfluum in Christo, quia, ut ipsi dicunt, ipse est Unctio, Ungens et Unctus. Secundæ classis dicunt, independentem ab unionem hypostaticâ, per unctionem tantum, quæ fit in ipso unionis actu, non decursu temporis, neque enim est sermo de septem donis Spiritus Sancti. Tertiæ classis cum secundis conveniunt in uno modo et discrepant in altero; negant quidem per unionem hypostaticam esse contra primæ sententiæ fautores; et affirmant cum secundis unctionem esse gratiam habitualement in Christo, negant tamen contra eodem quod fit filius naturalis, sed gratiæ, seu adoptivus.* [Whether Christ, as man, is made the natural Son of God by the hypostatical union, or by the grace of union, or by the unction of the Holy Spirit, or by habitual grace? Those of the first class say, by the hypostatical union only, independently of the unction of the Holy Spirit; nay, they exclude and reject habitual grace as a superfluous thing in Christ, because, as they say, He is Himself the Unction, the Anointer, and the Anointed. Those of the

second class say, independently of the hypostatical union, by the unction only, which takes place in the very act of union, not in the passage of time (for the discourse here is not concerning the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit). Those of the third class agree with the second in one way and differ in another; they deny indeed, against those who favour the first opinion, that it is by the hypostatical union; and they affirm with the second that the unction is habitual grace in Christ, but still deny, against the same, that He is made the natural son, but of grace, or by adoption.] The Copts have always been in favour of the first, yet they permit the other two to hold their doctrines as opinions; and as often as the bishops have attempted to unite them to the first, and still more to excommunicate them, they have had to beat a retreat from their capital, or residence of Gondar. Now the present bishop, a pupil of the English, and a Protestant and fanatic, has sought to bring them back to unity by the sword, and has succeeded, without, however, contenting any one of the parties: not favouring the first, because he says He received the unction of the Holy Spirit, nor favouring the two others, because he says He received it, but does not say what He became, the natural or adopted [Son]. Wherefore, the persecution has not been against the Catholics only, but also against the schismatics themselves, with the difference that the schismatics have suddenly yielded what they had maintained as of faith, whilst the Catholics have been suffering afflictions, and are suffering them continually, from the month of July last year to the present time, are groaning in chains, bound hand and foot, scourged, in some cases with fifty, and in others up to sixty or seventy blows, and thrust into underground dungeons. And thus stand things up to the present moment.

Of these views, that of the Adoptionists appears to coincide with the first opinion mentioned by Krapf, that of the Unionists with the second, and that of the Uctionists with the third. According to Major Harris, the Unionists (we adopt the term for convenience, though he does not use it) "deny the third birth upon the grounds that the reception of the Holy Ghost cannot be so styled." He adds that their faction is called by the opprobrious epithet of *Karra Hai-manot*, or Knife of the Faith, as having lopped off an acknowledged scriptural truth. A statement on the whole subject, by Dr. Gobat, Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem (quoted by Mr. Parkyns), will throw some additional light on the matter. After remarking, even more strongly than our MS. authority, that the three parties are so inimical to each other that they curse one another, and will no longer partake of the sacrament together, he proceeds:—

One party is of opinion that, when it is said that Jesus Christ was anointed with the Holy Spirit, it is meant that the Godhead was united with the human nature of Jesus Christ; and that in all the passages of the Bible where the Holy Spirit is represented as having been given to Jesus Christ, the name Holy Spirit only signifies the divinity of Christ, who had no need

of the assistance of the Holy Spirit, whom He could not receive, having always possessed Him. Their manner of expressing themselves is, that Jesus Christ *has* anointed; that He *has been* anointed; and that He himself *is* the unction. This party is chiefly in Tigré—the most exasperated one. Their doctrine was that of the last Coptic Abuna. The second opinion is, that when it is said that Jesus Christ was anointed with the Holy Spirit, it is signified merely that the Holy Spirit accomplished the union of the Godhead with the human nature in the person of Jesus Christ. This party is principally to be found in the provinces of Godjam and Lasta. The third opinion, predominating in all the other provinces of Abyssinia, and even in Shoa, is, that Jesus Christ, as man, and though united to the Godhead from the moment of His conception, received the Holy Ghost in the human part of His nature, in the same manner as we receive Him—viz., as a gift of the Father—in order that He might be enabled to accomplish, as man, the work of our redemption: whence they conclude that, because Jesus Christ received the Holy Spirit as we receive Him, His unction is to be called a third birth. These are the most tolerant. I have understood that, after my departure from Gondar, some of the most learned men left off calling this unction of Jesus Christ a birth. It appears that these differences of opinion are founded upon the different views they have adopted of the two natures of Jesus Christ; although, according to the letter, they are all Monophysites.

Whatever estimate is to be formed of the dogma of the three-fold birth, it has taken a great hold of the Abyssinian people, and the apparent unity which the coercive measures of the present Abuna have effected is perhaps only superficial. His opposition to the favourite doctrine exposed him for years to much personal danger. His house at Gondar was pillaged by the mob, and he had to fly into Tigré. On the accession of Theodorus, his enemies attempted to have him deposed; but he was supported by the emperor, who caused proclamation to be made that “His Majesty approved of the scriptural doctrine of the Abuna, and that in future all who adhered to the obnoxious dogma of the three-fold birth should be taught obedience by the giraffe” [or whip]. This was in vain protested against by the Shoa clergy. At present, a solemn abjuration of the doctrine forms as regular a part of the Abyssinian ordination service as the supremacy oath does of the Anglican. Mr. Stern tells us: “All being ranged before the chair of St. Mark, each candidate solemnly abjures the old heresy of the three births, and then, instead of the imposition of hands, receives the Abuna’s consecrating breath.” The same traveller, at an interview he had with the Abuna, saw priests in chains for having clung to this proscribed doctrine. They were sentenced to several months’ successive fasts, and to fines, and were threatened, in case of repetition of the offence, with banishment and the amputation of a leg



or an arm. Whatever lessons, therefore, the Abuna may have learned in his youth in the Church Missionary Society's Schools in Cairo, toleration certainly has not been included in them. It appears that the Metropolitan cannot legally inflict corporal punishment, but that in matters of faith, and particularly on questions relating to the disputed tenet of our Lord's birth, the king regularly supports the Abuna.

We have already seen that the Abyssinian Church bears decided witness to the Catholic doctrine concerning the invocation of saints; and this, considering its total isolation, for above a millennium, from all the movement of the West, is surely an important fact. In illustration of this, let us quote the following passage from the *Æthiopian Liturgy*, taking the translation of it from Renaudot, as rendered by a Protestant authority. One reads it with a sense of indignation at the want of candour of those who persist in calling the invocation of saints "a Romish corruption." The strangeness of many of the names shows the remoteness of the communion which appeals to them, whilst their emphatic accumulation evidences the fervour with which Abyssinia holds to this article of the faith:—

O Lord, save thy people and bless thine heritage . . . . through the prayers and supplications which shall be offered in our behalf by the lady of all, the holy and pure Mary, the mother of God; through the prayers of the glorious inhabitants of heaven, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Suriel; of the four incorporeal animals, and the twenty-four priests of heaven; of S. John Baptist, of our fathers the patriarchs, apostles, the seventy-two disciples and the three children; of S. Stephen, the chief of the deacons, S. George, S. Theodorus, S. Mercurius, S. Menna, S. Philotheus, S. Basilides, the holy father Nob, and all the martyrs; of our great lord and holy father Anthony; of our holy fathers the three Macarii, our father Bichoi, John, Cyrus, and Barsoma; of our father Salama, John Kemi; our righteous father Paul; and of the holy Greek fathers, Maximus, Demetrius, Moses the holy father, and the forty martyrs; and of our father Tecla Haimanoth; of our venerable father N. our patriarch, of Claudius our king; of all the just and elect who are signed with the sign of the Cross, and of the angel of this holy day.— ("Brett on the Liturgies," p. 65).

But as for the devotion which exists in Abyssinia towards the Blessed Virgin, Protestant travellers seem to lack words by which to express their observations of its intensity. They are scandalized at perceiving that beggars rely on an appeal for charity in her name being successful, or eliciting at least a humble excuse, if not alms, when similar entreaties in the Divine name are not always responded to.

Mr. Parkyns observes that "the ordinary cry of the common street beggars in Tigré is 'Silla Izgyheyr! Silla Medhainy



Allam !' (For the sake of God ! For the sake of the Saviour !) while, if he be very importunate, he will change his usual whining note, and add with persuasive emphasis, 'Silla Marian ! Silla Abouna Tekla Haimanout !' (For the sake of Mary ! For the sake of St. Tekla Haimanout !).'' According to Tellezius one of the old Catholic sources on Abyssinia in the sixteenth century, quoted by Ludolf, when the persecution was raging against Catholics in those days, the Abyssinian cry used to be for whoever was not an enemy of Mary to take up stones and cast them at her foes. Their religion, heretical and schismatical as it was, was so bound up with this devotion that they regarded all who might make them change it as hostile to Mary ; a new charge indeed to be urged against the sons of Ignatius.

The very name, "Slave of Mary," occurs in Abyssinia as a personal designation,\* reminding us of the "Servitude of Mary," which has been regarded as an invention or development peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church. In short, we cannot sufficiently impress upon the reader that the study of such a religion as that of Abyssinia is admirably calculated to convince people of the ignorance and injustice which regards as novelties introduced by Italians in the middle ages, usages and beliefs, which, in the remotest times, separatists from the Catholic Church took with them into the wilderness. At the same time, it is quite possible there may be in the Abyssinian devotions a tone of exaggeration out of harmony with the wisdom of the Catholic Church, considering that they are connected with a deeply erroneous theology concerning the Incarnation, which must necessarily colour their whole creed.

It is right to observe, before quitting this part of the subject, that the Abyssinian Church, whilst thus unequivocally invoking the prayers of the saints, also prays for them ; a practice of which primitive times also, and the Greek Church, afford examples. For instance, Ludolf quotes the following, with other similar invocations : "Remember, O Lord, the soul of thy servant our father, Tekla Haimanout, with his companions :"—though he is held in as much reverence by the Abyssinians, as S. Francis of Assisi or S. Dominic is by the Catholic Church. This fact bears much less than would appear at first sight, either on their views as to invocation, or as to the state of the departed. Little as to the former, since it does not interfere with the *cultus* of saints being one of the most prominent features of their daily life ; and little as to the latter, because they would hold it as a monstrous notion that their holy saints and princes

---

\* It is worthy of observation that this is also the origin of the Irish and Gaelic name, *Gilmurray*—*Giolla-Maire*—"Servant of Mary."

are still expiating sins in purgatory. They explain those prayers by the observation that we continually pray for many things we know that God Almighty has already granted. We might also add, that it is quite conceivable many prayers might be understood in a Catholic sense, viz., as supplication for the increase of the accidental glory of the saints, supposed of course to be in possession of the beatific vision. As to purgatory, if Ludolf's statements are correct, their ideas are vague, some holding that there are but two places of the departed, heaven and hell, others—which is the more common opinion—that there is a third place, where souls are detained, not enjoying the beatific vision before the resurrection. Be this as it may, it is certain that they offer mass for the dead, in the case of wealthy persons, daily for forty days after death; for others, five masses during the same space of time, on the 3rd, 7th, 12th, 30th, and 40th days; and for all, yearly, on the anniversary of their death.\*

The baptismal ceremonies of the Abyssinians, whilst in part of a dubious character, abound in interesting traces of the primitive ritual. Before entering the church, the 51st Psalm is read, and the catechumen twice receives an unction. There is also an imposition of hands, and an abjuration, in which the catechumen raises his right hand, turns to the west, and abjures Satan. Turning to the east, he declares his belief in the Nicene Creed, which the priest repeats. Passages from St. John, the Acts, and the Pauline epistles are read; oil is poured crosswise into the baptismal water, the catechumen is then led by the deacon into the pool, and is immersed by the priest; the latter using, according to Ludolf, who refers to Alvarez, the regular Catholic form of words. But he also admits that Jesuit missionaries stated there was very considerable variation in the words employed. Sometimes it was, "I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Trinity;" sometimes, "in the name of Christ;" or, "in the name of the Holy Ghost;" or, "in the water of Jordan." Or, "May God baptize thee!" or, "May God wash thee!" and the like. This was the principal reason for the conditional reiteration of baptism, which gave profound offence to the Abyssinians. After the immersion, the neophyte is received by the sponsors, is clad in a white garment, and led into the church. He then receives the holy communion, after which milk and honey are given him. The ceremonies are closed by the imposition of hands, and the blessing, "Go in peace,

---

\* Some very interesting remarks bearing closely on the line of argument in the text, will be found in a recent number of this REVIEW.—See vol. li. pp. 139—143.

sons of baptism." The foregoing is a description of adult baptism, which, in Ludolf's time at least, in consequence of conversions from the surrounding heathen, was not unfrequent. Infants are held in the sponsor's arms and receive baptism by sprinkling and ablution in the porch. Males used not to be baptized before the fortieth day after birth, females after the eightieth. It was also, and probably is still, the Æthiopian custom to administer to infants at baptism a drop from the chalice, in a spoon, together with a particle of the Host.

We may here notice a singular custom in the Abyssinian ritual. On the 11th January of the Æthiopic year, answering to the 6th of ours, they celebrate the feast of Epiphany, which in their calendar is called "the Baptism of Christ." It will be remembered that in the Catholic Church the gospel containing the testimony of S. John is read on the octave of the Epiphany; and with the Abyssinians, the celebration of the Epiphany appears to be associated with, or to mean the commemoration of, the baptism of our Lord by S. John, in the river Jordan. The eve of the feast is observed by ecclesiastics and the devout as a strict fast; in the afternoon, they receive the Holy Eucharist, and in the evening a procession is made with the holy arks, or *tabots*, under canopies, to the nearest stream, on the banks of which tents have been erected, and the whole population, old and young, is assembled. The night is spent in chanting hymns and psalms; and before dawn, the people bathe in the stream, the water of which has been previously blessed by the priests. The old Jesuit writers stated that this ceremonial was characterized by an utter disregard to decency, in which one recent and important authority, Major Harris, abundantly confirms them. At the same time, Bruce, as reliable a witness as the latter, denies these gross disorders, and disputes them on antecedent grounds, connected with the customs of Abyssinia, and also because the Abuna, bred up in the desert of S. Macarius, could not sanction proceedings of this kind. Mr. Parkyns does not notice any such abuses. It is very possible, in so large a country as Abyssinia, the usage might differ in different provinces. What appears very certain is, that drunkenness prevails to a disgraceful extent. But the reason for which at present we advert to the ceremony is controversial. They call this festival *temkat*, i.e., baptism, and the old Catholic missionaries appear to have thought that it was regarded not as a mere lustration, but as a repetition of baptism, properly so called. We are not prepared to say that this was the case; but the following statement of Major Harris, however broadly expressed, is quite enough to show that the ceremony has relations to doctrine of an erroneous kind, more

especially when we place it in connection with the tendencies shown by the Abyssinian dogma of the third birth, in one of its forms :—

He who neglects to undergo the annual purification enjoined on this day by the Æthiopic Church, is considered to carry with him the burden of every sin committed during the preceding twelve months, and to be surely visited by sickness and misfortune ; whereas those who perform the rite are believed to have emerged thoroughly cleansed and regenerated. (Harris's "*Highlands of Æthiopia*," vol. iii. p. 200.)

As to the sacrament of penance, the views of the Abyssinian Church appear to be vague. Confession is said not to be exacted until after the age of twenty-five, and then to be only of a general character, expressed by the words, "I have sinned, I have sinned," unless in the case of three greater crimes,—homicide, adultery, and theft ; with which exceptions, the early Catholic missionaries had great difficulty in inducing their converts to confess anything, naming the offence. Where these or other grievous sins have been committed, it is customary, as we have said, to confess to the Abuna in person, who assigns penances in proportion to the magnitude of the offence,—fasting or stripes, the latter being forthwith administered by his attendants. The severity displayed in one instance we have met with, where a penitent who confessed the habitual commission of incest, and was sentenced to a life-long fast, reminds one of the rigid satisfaction demanded by the early Church. The seal of confession is not part of the Abyssinian law of penance, according to Ludolf, but Major Harris contradicts this ; it certainly would hardly apply to the loose method we have described in the lesser offences, and the greater seem, in some cases at least, to be confessed in public. We find, as a prevailing feature of Abyssinian theology and practice, an absence of fixity, which resembles some of the characteristics of Anglicanism. As to sacraments in general, according to Ludolf, they assign no definite number to them, and the same writer states that confirmation and extreme unction are unknown in the Abyssinian Church, as to which it seems certain that he must have been misinformed, since the Coptic Church, with which the Abyssinian is in the closest connection, possesses those sacraments. As to marriage, the habits of the Abyssinians are of the most irregular kind. Concubinage, by which we mean so-called civil marriages, not binding beyond the will of the parties, may be said to be the rule, and marriages in the face of the Church the exception, scarce one in a hundred demanding them. The former are celebrated as regular marriages, with the festivities appointed by national custom,

assemblages of the families, cavalcade of bridesmen, introduction of the bride with tapers, mutual declaration of marriage, and an agreement as to the property brought by each,—the husband promising a stipulated number of cows and *shamas*, the father-in-law usually bestowing arms and household furniture. A priest may or may not be present to give an admonition, but the ceremony is not considered to have any religious character, and the alliance may be dissolved on the shortest notice and for the most trifling reasons. A second marriage is then permitted, but in that case the husband, whilst still probably living in perfect friendship with the woman from whom he separates, and even maintaining her in a neighbouring house, no longer treats her as his wife. It may often happen that these civil marriages end in a lasting attachment, and then the parties seek for the sanction of the Church. The religious marriage appears to consist principally in the reception of the holy communion, from which, as Ludolf was told, those who have more wives than one are excluded; and the tie thus made is indissoluble. We do not find that polygamy, except in the sense we have explained, is prevalent, unless in the case of the sovereign, who has, or at least had in former times, hundreds of concubines. Probably the same practice may prevail with the great chiefs. One remarkable rule obtained with the king of Abyssinia. He was regarded as bound by the same matrimonial laws that priests are subjected to, and could not marry a second wife. At the suggestion of a late Anglo-Abyssinian chief, Mr. Bell, whom most recent travellers in the country mention, the present king, Theodorus, has broken this rule. His first wife having died, he has, in defiance of the law of his religion, married another wife, and this step was sanctioned by the Abuna, who administered the holy communion to the pair shortly afterwards. The king is said to be using his influence to restrain the practice of concubinage, and one of the latest travellers states that many chiefs have latterly followed the royal example in this respect.

We now come to the important subject of the rite for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the Abyssinian Church. In the first place it may be remarked that their public worship means assisting at mass only. There are no sermons, or very rarely, but passages from the New Testament are read, in *Æthiopic*. The construction of the churches is very peculiar, but we shall have a better opportunity of describing it when we come to examine the affinity of the Abyssinian Church to Judaism. For the present we have only to state that in the Holy of Holies there is a table, resting on four pillars, and over it the *tabot* or ark, to which extreme reverence

is attached, and upon this are placed the paten and chalice. All are allowed to partake of the chalice, and in its administration a spoon is used, terminating in a cross. The wine used by the Abyssinian Church for the altar is of a sort that can scarcely be called wine at all. It is merely the juice expressed from dried raisins that have been steeped in water, and appears not to have undergone the process of fermentation. Indeed, Bruce describes it as a thick fluid, more resembling marmalade. Others give an opposite account, and say that it may be considered as simply water. At any rate it can, generally speaking, only be wine in name, so that, so far as it is concerned, the question as to the validity of their consecration is superfluous. The eucharistic bread is prepared with much mystery by the deacons, in a small building called the Bethlehem, adjoining each church. It is leavened (so Ludolf, after Tellezius, but Bruce says the contrary), except on Holy Thursday, and is stamped with a S. Andrew's Cross. The reception of the Holy Communion is said to be barbarous and disgusting in its manner. It is part of the Abyssinian notions of high breeding to eat in a gormandizing way, in large mouthfuls and with much noise; and the great men are permitted to practise this habit, even at the altar, in a way which is not only shocking but difficult to reconcile with that belief in the Real Presence which the Abyssinian formularies certainly inculcate. We do not, however, suppose that these poor people intend any irreverence. Communicants are very few in number, chiefly children, ecclesiastics, and married people who have received the sanction of the Church for their union, and who, as we have seen, form very far the minority of those regarded as living in matrimony. Gifts are offered by some at the celebration of the Eucharist, such as bread, oil, first-fruits, and tithes. In large churches, and on high festivals, four or five ecclesiastics are required, a priest, "sub-priest," deacon, and sub-deacon. The ceremonial is described as abounding in that clash and clang of rude instruments which might be expected among semi-civilized people like the Abyssinians.

The *Æthiopian* liturgy, or canon of the mass, though bearing a general resemblance to that of S. Basil (used in the Patriarchate of Alexandria), is on the whole a distinct composition. It begins with some prayers addressed through the mediation of the saints, in particular the evangelists, apostles, the 500 brethren, and 318 orthodox, that is, the fathers of the council of Nice. This passage bears a great affinity to the introduction of the Roman canon of the mass. Then there are prayers for the patriarch, the celebrant, the king, and all in necessity; for the departed in the faith, for those who take care



of the incense, the oblations, the sacred veils, books, and vessels. Other prayers follow through the mediation of saints, which we have already quoted, and some versicles and responses of a sublime, Oriental character. The prayer of consecration we transcribe as follows :—

*[Here the priest shall lay his hands upon the censer, and then extend them over the oblation.]*

*People.*—According to Thy mercy, O God, and not according to our iniquities. *[And this is said thrice.]*

*Priest.*—He extended His hands at His passion ; He suffered, that He might release those from sufferings who trust in Thee ; of His own free will He delivered Himself up to suffer that He might destroy death, break the bonds of Satan, and trample upon hell ; that He might establish His testament, and manifest His resurrection. In the same night in which He was betrayed He took bread into His holy, blessed, and immaculate hands ; He looked up to heaven, to Thee His Father ; He gave thanks, He blessed, He sanctified it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat ye all of this ; this bread is my Body, which is broken for you for the remission of sins. *Amen.*

*People.*—Amen, Amen, Amen. We believe and are certain ; we praise thee, O Lord our God ; this is truly Thy Body, and so we believe.

*Priest.*—Likewise also He blessed and sanctified the cup of thanksgiving, and said to them, Take, drink ye all of this ; this is the cup of my Blood, which shall be shed for you, for the redemption of many. *Amen.*

*People.*—Amen. This is truly Thy Blood, and we believe it.

*Priest.*—And as often as ye do this, ye shall do it in remembrance of Me.

*People.*—We show forth Thy death, O Lord ; we believe Thy holy resurrection, Thy ascension, and second coming ; we beseech Thee, O Lord our God ; we believe this to be true.

Prayers follow at the breaking of the Host ; then there is an absolution, commencing with a reference to the promise made to S. Peter concerning the rock, and keys of the kingdom of heaven. After this communion is received as follows :—

*Priest.*—The holy, precious, living, and true Body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which is given for the remission of sins and eternal life to all who receive it with faith. *Amen.* The holy, precious, life-giving, and true Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which is given for the remission of sins, and to eternal life to all who receive it with faith. *Amen.* This is, in truth, the Body and Blood of Emmanuel. *Amen.* I believe, I believe, I believe, from this time forth, now, and for evermore. *Amen.* This is the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which He received of the Lady of us all, the holy and pure Virgin Mary, and made it one with His Divinity, without any commixture or confusion, any division or alteration of the Divinity. He witnessed a good confession in the days of Pontius Pilate, and of His own free will delivered Himself up for us upon the wood of the holy Cross. *Amen.* I believe, I believe, I believe, that this



Divinity was not separated from His humanity ; no, not for an hour, or so much as the twinkling of an eye : He delivered Himself up for us, and purchased salvation, remission of sins, and eternal life, for all who receive Him by faith. *Amen.* I believe, I believe, I believe, from this time forth, now and for evermore. *Amen.*

In communicating the people, the priest says, "This is the bread of life, which came down from heaven, the truly precious body of Emmanuel our God." And similarly with the chalice : "This is the cup of life, which came down from heaven, the precious blood of Christ."

Previous to the reception, the sub-deacon pours water into the hands of the communicant, with which he washes his mouth, and then receives. Censers are meanwhile waving in the Holy of Holies, where, at this part of the service (according to Mr. Stern), the priests wash their hands. He says also that the heads and garments of the communicants are sprinkled, whilst the priest utters these words :—

If you think that I have now cleansed your garments and purified your bodies, and yet continue to cherish hatred and malice in your heart, I tell you that the body of Christ will prove to be a burning fire to consume you, and His blood a bottomless sea to drown you !

We do not find these words in the *Æthiopian Liturgy*, but they bear some resemblance to a passage which occurs in this part of the Mass in one of the *Coptic Liturgies*, where the celebrant, turning to the people with the Holy Sacrament, says :—

Behold the bread of the saints ! Let him who is free from sin approach. But let him who is stained with sin retire, lest God strike him with his lightning ; for me, I wash my hands of his sin.\*

Before quitting the church, each communicant, to prevent desecration, drinks a cup of water. (This resembles a custom we have witnessed in Catholic churches in Bavaria, where the communicant, immediately after he has received, drinks a small quantity of wine, as he kneels at the rails.) During the day they abstain from expectorating.

We suppose no unprejudiced person could question the proposition that this ritual, simply understood, conveys the doctrine of transubstantiation. If that doctrine is not held by the Abyssinian Church, words are used on the most solemn occasions which are only calculated to mislead, supposing them to be taken in their plain and natural sense. There appears, however, a difference of opinion on this subject. Ludolf, from

---

\* See DUBLIN REVIEW for June, 1850, art. "The Coptic Church."

the information of his friend, Abba Gregorius, disputes their belief on this head. The latter seems, when his attention was invited to the words of the Liturgy, to have talked like an Anglican, to have said it was a mystery, to have admitted a Real Presence, but to have denied transubstantiation. This is certainly not conclusive, when we recollect how close to Protestantism so high a dignitary as the Abuna in the present day can be, who did not learn his views in Æthiopia. According to Mr. Parkyns, "some, but not all, of the Abyssinians believe in the transubstantiation of sacramental bread and wine, and assert that the actual body and blood of our Saviour are partaken of by the faithful, but that an angel takes them away from an unbeliever, and restores the bread and wine, in his hands, to their natural state, such as they were previous to the benediction." With this Mr. Stern's view nearly agrees. He relates, however, a legend from the Abyssinian authorized treatise, called *Haimanout Mysteer*, or "Mysteries of the Faith," which could have been found in no country except one where transubstantiation was a prevailing belief, and with which, in some form or other, all are familiar in Catholic books of pious reading on the Holy Sacrifice. There was a monk who doubted of transubstantiation, or, as Mr. Stern calls it, "the material presence." Two of his brethren retired to a holy desert to pray for him, after obtaining a delay of punishment for a week. "On the day of their return, whilst they were devoutly performing mass in the convent church, behold the bread, in the act of consecration, suddenly changed into a beautiful infant, which a radiant and resplendent angel, bearing the sword of divine justice, sacrificed and carried up to heaven. The heretical monk who saw the miracle became henceforth a most zealous and devout advocate of transubstantiation." Mr. Stern adds, "the erudite reject the legend, and in their sentiments approximate to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation." Whether this be the case or not, the evidence of the Liturgy of the Æthiopian Church as to its primitive doctrine on this head, and of such a legend as the foregoing, in a symbolical work, as to the manner in which the doctrine was understood, is quite enough to afford an important testimony in favour of the Catholic belief.

We proceed to consider a particular characteristic of the Abyssinian schism, which, however it has been attempted to explain it away in certain details, is far too decided not to be regarded as one of its most striking features. This is its approximation in various points to Judaism. Take first the material arrangement of their churches. These buildings are of a barbarous appearance, circular in form, with a conical thatch surmounted by an iron cross and adorned with ostrich

eggs. On entering, it is observed that just as the Jewish temple was divided into three compartments—the court of the people, the court of the priests, and the Holy of Holies,—so an Abyssinian church is divided into three parts. The first, called *Kene Máhelet*, running all round the building, is divided from the second by a circular wall, concentric with the outer one. Beyond this wall the laity may not pass, except to receive holy communion. All entrance into the church is denied to pagans. The exterior face of this wall of separation is adorned with paintings of the saints, S. Michael, S. George, the B. Virgin, &c., with other religious emblems, the rudeness of all which provokes the sneer of the Protestant traveller. In the second compartment, called *Makdas*, appropriated to priests, the religious services take place. Here are suspended in cotton bags round the walls the bones of deceased worthies, until they can be transported by the nearest relative to the sacred shrine of Debra Libanos, where are entombed the relics of Tekla Haimanout. The third compartment is the Holy of Holies, or *Kedás Kedisen*. Into this, Major Harris says that only the Alaka is admitted. We presume he means that no layman but the Alaka can be admitted. Behind the veil of this division the consecration of the elements takes place, the vessels of the altar are deposited, and the *tabot*, or ark, to which we have already referred, is placed under a silken canopy. This ark, which is not like our tabernacles, corresponds to the Jewish ark of the covenant, and is an object of the profoundest veneration. It is a wooden box, the size, form, and material of which are exactly prescribed by the canons of the Abyssinian Church. It must be  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet long by 1 foot broad, and 4 inches deep, having a large cross in the middle, and twelve smaller ones, to represent Christ and his Apostles. It is anointed and christened by the Abuna in the name of some saint or angel, and is said to contain a scroll on which is written the name of the patron saint of the church. According to Major Harris, they make vows and oblations to the *tabot*, each individual selecting one for his special veneration. All prostrate themselves as it is carried in procession, and when it is replaced in the Holy of Holies the priests loudly exclaim, “The temple of the Eternal God!” Here there is evidently a superstition based on Judaism. But this is by no means all. The various disqualifications of the Levitical code forbid entrance into the church. If a man has entered a room where a child has been recently born, he is unclean. The same is the case if he has touched polluted garments, and many similar prohibitions exist, which require purification. Circumcision is universally practised. Abstinence also from the kinds of meat forbidden by the Jewish law is a rule among Abyssini-

nians. Thus they refuse to eat animals which chew the cud but do not divide the hoof, and abstain from swine's flesh, and from the sinew which shrank (Gen. xxxii. 35). Indeed this scrupulosity is carried by some beyond the Jewish law. There are particular families in Abyssinia who will not eat of certain clean animals, or of certain parts of any animal—for instance, the tongue or the heart—because some ancestor of theirs had made a vow on the subject; and all animals killed for food must be killed in a particular time, with the head turned towards Jerusalem, and the invocation of the B. Trinity used when the knife is passed across the throat. To these points of resemblance may be added, besides some instances already mentioned (as the existence of the class of *debterahs*, or scribes, and the permission of polygamy), the practice of dancing in their religious ceremonies, which, though not absolutely unknown in the Catholic Church (it occurs, we believe, in some functions in Spanish churches), is so common in Abyssinia as that Major Harris styles it the chief point of their worship. We see in it a trace of the dancing of David before the ark; but, as may be supposed, it has degenerated into something very wild and uncouth. Abstinence from servile labour on Saturdays is another trace of Judaism. Among their civil usages we find one that bears a great affinity to the Jewish law concerning cities of refuge. Asylum is permitted to homicides in churches, which of course might be illustrated from mediæval times in Europe. But the fugitive is permitted to retreat into another province, and boundaries are fixed beyond which the pursuer may not go—the Taccazy between Tigré and Amhara, and the Abai between Shoa and Gojam. Certain towns are also named where the criminal will be safe, as Axum, Waldubbe, Gundigundi, Debra Damo, Debra Abai. In the principal Abyssinian law-book, to which we shall presently refer, the Jewish *lex talionis*, "an eye for an eye," &c., is enacted, but whether it is enforced we have not been able to discover.

It is true that the Abyssinians themselves have denied, as to some of these usages, that they are practised in a Jewish sense. Thus the confession of Claudius (one of their kings at the time of the Portuguese connection with Abyssinia) attributes the Abyssinian circumcision to merely human reasons; and the Abba Gregorius denied the lawfulness of polygamy, except that it was unpunished by the civil magistrate, and compared the abstinence of his countrymen from swine's flesh to that of Europeans from horse-flesh. But making all allowance for these excuses, the fact is evident that there reigns throughout the Abyssinian religion a general and unmistakable resemblance to Judaism.

The Abyssinian calendar would form a curious study of itself. We can only here indicate some of the more characteristic features. We find in it also traces of the Judaizing spirit. On the 28th day of every month are commemorated Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and others of the holy men of the Old Testament have also their feast-days, as Enoch, Job, Samuel, Elias, Jeremias, &c., &c. A great devotion is evinced to S. Michael, who is honoured on the 12th day of every month. This repetition is frequent in the calendar. The nativity of our Lord is assigned to the 29th day of every month. "The conception of S. Mary" belongs to the 16th December, answering to the 12th in the Julian calendar; the circumcision of Christ to January 6th (1st); but their year commences with September. "Birthday of Our Lady Mary," September 10th. "Mary the Holy Virgin" occurs in some day of every month, usually the 21st. "The death of Our Lady Mary" is celebrated on the 21st January (16th). "The ascension of the body of the Holy Virgin," on the 16th August (9th August). "Peter the Apostle," on August 7th (July 31st). "Peter and Paul," on July 5th (June 29th), and again on the 14th of the same month. Alexandrian patriarchs, as may be supposed, often occur, and crowds of other Alexandrian, Greek, or Æthiopian saints, whose names have never reached the West. On the other hand, a Western name hardly ever appears. We notice the name of "Liberius, Patriarch of Rome," on October 9th. The 318 bishops of Nice, the 200 bishops of Ephesus, the 150 bishops of Constantinople, are collectively honoured, each on days appropriated to those respective councils. One of the greatest Abyssinian festivals is that of Epiphany, which we have already described. Among the others which are observed with the greatest devotion is the day which follows it, January 12th (7th), when they commemorate the nuptials of Cana in Galilee, and also honour S. Michael the Archangel. "The Feast of the Glorious Cross" (called Mascal) is the one celebrated with the greatest pomp, and on it the custom prevails of lighting great fires, like the old Western practice on Midsummer-eve. It is painful to add, that in connection with this festival we have once more to remark a very decided instance of the Judaizing character of the Abyssinian Church, if it is not rather a remnant of paganism. Oxen are led three times round the bonfires, slaughtered, and left as a prey to the wild animals. It is also common for individuals to make vows to slaughter on the anniversary of their patron saints a bullock, a sheep, or the like, in order to conciliate his favours for the rest of the year. Families as well as individuals have their patron saints, whose anniversary is handed down from father to son as the family

jubilee. The most favourite patrons are St. Michael, the Blessed Virgin, John the Baptist; and among the Abyssinian saints Tekla Haimanout, and Gabra Menfos Kouddos. (The latter name signifies "Slave of the Holy Spirit.") Major Harris says, "S. Michael and the Holy Virgin are here venerated as in no other country in the world—the former as the martial leader of all the choirs of angels, the latter as chief of all saints and queen of heaven and earth, and both are considered as the great intercessors for mankind" (vol. iii. p. 151).

The fasts in the Abyssinian Church are very numerous and very severe. Their Lent lasts fifty-five days; their Advent fast the last ten days of October and the whole of November; "the fast of the Apostles," from ten to forty days; "the fast of the Holy Virgin," sixteen days; "the fast of Jonas," three days; besides the Wednesdays and Fridays. They require altogether nearly two hundred and sixty days of fasting throughout the year, and it appears that they are pretty faithfully observed. Their custom does not permit eating on fast-days till late in the afternoon, except on Saturdays and Sundays in the long fasts, and their diet is unpalatable, consisting of dried peas or spinach, with a vegetable oil of disagreeable taste. They have a very singular rule for determining the time of day when they may eat in ordinary fasting-time. It is regulated by the length of a man's shadow, measured by his own feet. Thus, in Advent, during each day, a man does not eat until his shadow measures nine and a half feet. During Good Friday and Holy Saturday, the priests and rigidly devout eat nothing whatever, but fast absolutely for forty-eight hours. As to the Lent fast, we have again to notice a Jewish practice. They scrupulously cleanse and polish all the culinary utensils, that no particle of meat or prohibited food may remain upon them.

It may be said that, on the whole, and notwithstanding the many highly interesting points of contact between it and Catholicism, the Abyssinian schism presents, in a remarkable manner, the aspect of a *corrupt* Church. The phrase is applied falsely by Protestants to the Catholic Church, with her majestic organization, her firm and complete possession of truth, losing nothing, adding nothing, but handing down from age to age all she has received, fortified, as may be needed, against the ever-varied assaults of heresy, and only more fully and harmoniously exhibited as time proceeds. But in Abyssinia, whilst, as it were by accident, certain great truths and salutary practices have been retained, some have been placed in extravagant and disproportionate prominence, others have been lost or are denied, a whole brood of dubious or un-Christian practices have



been adopted from Judaism, and doctrine has pullulated with a sort of vermiculate growth into strange forms. Side by side with a cruel rigorism in some things, we observe elsewhere a licence which the pure morality of the Catholic Church would not tolerate for an instant.

Hence, we are not surprised that in the Abyssinian as in the Greek schism there exists a bitter hostility to the Catholic Church, that all the influence of the Abuna is exerted to keep Catholic missionaries out of the country, whilst, on the other hand, he favours and encourages the settlement of Protestants. We may be certain that his instinct does not deceive him, and that let the saint-worship of the Abyssinians be as unbounded as they please, the law laid down by De Maistre will be strictly verified—*Toute église schismatique est Protestante*. It is very certain, however, that there are also many in Abyssinia who desire to be united with the Holy See. For a short time; the efforts of the Jesuit missionaries in the seventeenth century obtained a public reconciliation by the royal authority; and although this was swept away by lamentable convulsions, the seed has never been lost. It may here be interesting to place before the reader the grounds upon which the Abyssinian schismatics endeavour to justify their estrangement from the Holy See. The following abstract of them is supplied in the letter already quoted from a native Abyssinian Catholic. He says:—

Among the other objections commonly alleged by the schismatical writers in their ecclesiastical history, and of which they offer solutions, are the following, literally quoted. Whether the Roman Church, the see of Peter, is greater than other churches, from the fact that Christ said to him, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church?" Again, whether Christ put forth these words because of the Roman Church alone, or rather because of the universal Church, which is from the beginning unto the end, one and not manifold? They reply, We know not how one is greater than another, one inferior and another superior. For it is not after the manner of the synagogue of Jerusalem, which was greater than other synagogues, in which they neither sacrificed nor adored; it is not so, but as Christ is one, so the Church is one, which He gained by His blood. Wherefore the fathers of the second oecumenical council taught in these words: We believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,—be it observed, they did not say in two, but in one. Accordingly, if it is true that the Roman is greater than other churches, we ought to say, we believe in greater and lesser churches. God forbid. As you divide Christ into two natures, do you so divide His Church? Christ is one, and the Church is one, and we believe in one.\*

---

\* Schismatici scriptores in eorum historiâ ecclesiasticâ, inter cæteras objectiones quas passim afferre solent, atque ab ipsis solvi, ad litteram sic habent.

As if the body did not derive unity from the head, or as if the removal of the head would not at once destroy unity in the whole body, and disintegrate all its elements. It is noticeable also how their deep-rooted heresy about the divine and human natures appears where you would scarcely expect it—in a dispute on the supremacy of the Chair of Peter. It is, nevertheless, very curious that one of the Abyssinian church books, called "The Court of Emperors" [so styled by our native authority above mentioned, who means, we presume, the *Fathe Negest*, "The King's Court, or Book of Laws," in Krapf's catalogue of Abyssinian literature], ascribed to the fathers of the Council of Nice, and said to have been given by them to the emperor Constantine, contains testimony of the strongest kind to the supremacy of the Holy See, declaring the necessity of four patriarchs from the analogy of the four Gospels, the four rivers of Paradise, the four seasons, winds and elements, and that the head and judge among those four patriarchs is the bishop of the Roman See, even as Peter, to whom was given power over all the princes and congregations of Christians. We do not refer to this by way of laying stress on the passage in itself, because the name "patriarch" shows that it must be taken from the apocryphal canons of the Council of Nice. But it is singular that it should occur in a book held in veneration by the Abyssinians, as the writer states, beyond any other book, perhaps not excepting, so to speak, the Gospel itself. He exclaims, humorously, "Woe to him that contradicts it! They would flay him alive like S. Bartholomew." When this passage is cited against the Abyssinian divines, they say, "We have been long separated, and custom has the force of law." When one goes on to question them, he says that they play with words, and talk irrelevantly, *canunt extra chorum*. A Catholic missionary, the Rev. F. Leon des Avanchers, writes, in 1850,

---

Utrum major sit ecclesia Romana, Petri sedes, aliis ecclesiis, ex eo quod Christus ei dixerit, Tu es Petrus, et supra hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam? Rursus, num Christus protulit hæc verba propter solam ecclesiam Romanam, an vero propter universam ecclesiam, quæ est a fine usque ad finem, una et non multiplex? Respondent, Nescimus quomodo una major sit altera, una inferior et altera superior. Non est enim quemadmodum synagoga Jerusalem, quæ fuit major aliis synagogis, in quibus nec sacrificabant nec adorabant, non est sic, sed sicut unus est Christus, ita ecclesia una, quam acquisivit suo sanguine. Propterea patres secundi concilii œcumenici docuerunt his verbis:—Credimus in unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam et apostolicam,—notandum, non dixere in duas sed in unam. Itaque, si verum est Romanam esse majorem aliis, nos dicere debemus, credimus in majores et minores ecclesias. Absit. Num sicut Christum in duas naturas dividitis, ita ecclesiam ejus? Unus est Christus, et una ecclesia, et nos credimus in unam.

"Although the Christians of Abyssinia profess the error of Dioscorus, . . . a great number of them live in utter ignorance of the matter, and think that their bishop, or the Abuna, sent to them by the schismatic patriarch of Cairo, is in communication with the pope." \*

In fact, the extreme impatience shown by the Abuna of the action of Catholic missionaries in the country, their recent expulsion, and the severe persecution sustained by those who hold to them, clearly show that a powerful movement exists in that direction. We find that, in 1849, while Mgr. de Jacobis received episcopal consecration as bishop of Nilopolis, and by an extraordinary exception passed over from the Latin to the Ethiopian, Monsignor Massaia, V.A. of the Gallas, ordained at the same time twenty-five native priests. About the same time, Teclafa, the superior of one thousand monks, was converted, with his whole monastery, to the Catholic Church, and afterwards formed three congregations in the true fold. Some years previously, in 1842, Krapf, the Protestant missionary, speaks of Ubie, the chief of Tigré, as "working so strenuously in the interests of Rome, that the Abuna could not prevail upon the prince to cherish the Abyssinian Church to which he belonged." For the moment, no doubt, the prospects of Catholicism in this country are under a cloud, in spite of the truly apostolic labours and sufferings of the excellent Mgr. de Jacobis, to whose virtues the Protestant traveller Parkyns renders a generous tribute. The strong and newly constituted ruler of Abyssinia backs the Abuna in his hostility to the Catholic faith, and as the good Abyssinian priest, to whom we have been indebted for so much curious information, writes (on Oct. 8th, 1853), "they are both of the same lump (*della stessa farina*) and purpose, the one in religion, and the other in government, to have the world *sub ditione unâ*. But let us hope after the tempest will succeed a calm." In this aspiration we heartily unite; and, improbable as it is that these words will ever make their way to those distant regions, we should be glad to imagine that the Abyssinian Catholics, pining in dungeons under a rude tyranny, yet preserving the flame of pure religion burning in their bosoms, could know that they have the deep sympathy and fervent prayers of many widely removed from them in blood and in all earthly associations, yet indissolubly one with them in the faith of Christ and the communion of His vicar upon earth.

---

\* "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith," vol. xiv. p. 370. For many interesting details relating to Catholic missions in Abyssinia, see Marshall's "Christian Missions," vol. ii. ch. vii.

## ART. III.—INTRINSIC END OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

*Du Spirituel et du Temporel dans l'Eglise.* Lettre de Monseigneur [Parisis] l'Evêque d'Arras à Son Excellence M. Thouvenel. Paris, 1860.

"A RECIPROCAL benefit," says M. Thouvenel, as quoted in this most telling little work—"a reciprocal benefit has irrevocably accrued to modern societies in the separation which has been accomplished in the two domains of the religious and political order." The expression, indeed, in itself is somewhat vague; but, as used by M. Thouvenel and other politicians of his school, it has a most definite and intelligible meaning. "The State, as such, has no religion; has no concern with revelation; nor any obligation of listening to the Church's voice: political science is wholly independent of theological." There is no principle which the revolutionary party throughout Europe regards as more fundamental than this; and there is none which more gives to that party its distinctive character.\*

On the other hand, if we would know what judgment has been pronounced on this principle by the highest earthly authority, let us study the allocution delivered by the reigning Pontiff in June, 1862. In that allocution, the Holy Father describes at some length the tenets of those evil men who are now banded together against every high and holy interest. And what is it which he places at the very head of those errors? "They blush not," he says, "to assert that the knowledge of philosophical and moral truth, and also *that the laws of a nation*, may and ought to withdraw themselves from [the jurisdiction of] Divine revelation and the Church's authority."† "That philosophical and moral study should be independent of the Church's authority:" here is rationalism. "That a nation's laws should be thus independent:" here is revo-

---

\* Après avoir d'âge en âge triomphé successivement des sanglantes persécutions du glaive, des sophismes acharnés de l'hérésie, et de l'effroyable dépravation de ses propres enfans, l'Eglise s'est trouvé en présence d'un ennemi nouveau qu'on peut appeller la politique des gouvernemens. Cette politique . . . c'était au fond la cause des intérêts matériels et de l'orgueil humain luttant contre l'intérêt des âmes et le règne de Dieu.—*De l'Eglise et l'Etat*, par Mgr. Parisis, p. 4.

† Haud erubescunt asserere philosophicarum rerum morumque scientiam, itemque civiles leges, posse et debere à Divinâ revelatione et ecclesiæ auctoritate declinare.

lutionism. What rationalism is in the intellectual order, that is revolutionism in the political; and from these two poisonous sources flows forth that pestilential stream of speculation and action which is the misery of our time. The Catholic reviewer, then, can have no more important duty than to grapple with this two-headed hydra; and it is under a sense of that duty that we propose, in our present article, to investigate the nature and extent of a State's legitimate functions in promoting the spiritual welfare of its members. Our task is rendered more delicate, but at the same time more important, by the circumstance that we are not acquainted with any modern Catholic work which occupies this precise ground; and both the delicacy and the importance of our undertaking are still further increased by two great difficulties which meet us at the very outset.

The first of these difficulties is the danger of an opposite and still worse extreme. Detestable as is the doctrine that a civil governor (as such) has no concern with Divine revelation and the Church's voice, the doctrine is still more detestable that he possesses supreme authority in spirituals; and we must watch therefore carefully, lest, in contending against political atheism, we give any kind of colour to a tyrannical and usurping Erastianism. It might be thought, indeed, on the first blush, that all our danger from revolutionists is on the side of licence; but the most cursory survey of facts will teach us better. They begin, no doubt, with laying down, as a broad axiom, that the spiritual and political can never clash: they are obliged to do so, for the purpose of maintaining that the Church has no right to interfere with what they call the proper work of the State. But having affirmed this proposition in general, they proceed to deny it in every particular instance: they discern always and everywhere some (supposed) political consequences in the Church's most purely spiritual action. Having started, then, by inferring from one premiss that the Church has no right of interfering with the "proper office of the State," they end by inferring, from precisely the opposite premiss, that the State has a full right of interfering, and that almost in every detail, with the proper office of the Church. And, accordingly, the Holy Father, in the very passage from which we have just quoted, after having censured their licence, proceeds to censure their usurpation and tyranny.\* Indeed, it is surely no exag-

---

\* *Hinc perversè comminiscuntur, civilem potestatem posse se immiscere rebus quæ ad religionem, mores, et regimen spirituale pertinent; atque etiam impedire, quominus sacrorum antistites et fideles populi, cum Romano Pontifice, supremo totius ecclesiæ pastore divinitus constituto, liberè communicent, &c.*

geration to say that their tyranny is in principle far more monstrous even than that of our Henry VIII. or James I.; against which latter Suarez felt himself called on so vigorously to protest. Henry VIII., in claiming spiritual dominion, at least claimed it as God's vicegerent, as entrusted by Him with the care of his people's eternal welfare. But these men are avowedly endeavouring that purely secular considerations may reign supreme; that the spiritual may be sacrificed to the material, and the eternal to the temporal.

This, then, is the first difficulty which meets us: the necessity of avoiding Scylla no less than Charybdis, and the great need for accuracy of vision in discerning the true middle course. Our second difficulty is hardly less serious, but of a totally different kind. Certain very eminent theologians, of whom Suarez may be taken as a representative instance, seem, on the surface, to maintain an opinion tending at least to the error which we combat: the opinion, namely, that civil government, as such, is exceeding its prescribed limits if it labour to promote directly spiritual good. We are perfectly certain, indeed, that these theologians not only are not inclined, but are in the extremest degree opposed, to any such opinion; and it will be one object of this article to vindicate our conviction on this head. Still it cannot be denied that certain expressions used by them may be plausibly alleged against us; and we cannot be surprised, therefore, that certain Catholic writers of the present day, and writers who justly claim our deep respect and admiration, occasionally use expressions which we regret. These writers, indeed, fully admit that no civil law can be binding on the conscience which is contrary either to the natural or the Divine positive law, or to any law of the Church acting within her own sphere; and they admit, accordingly, that a civil ruler (so far as he has means of knowing these various higher laws) violates his duty in putting forward any such enactment. But they seem to hold that, within these limits, the only legitimate end of the civil governor's legislation and administration is his country's temporal good; that if he attempts to promote directly her spiritual interests, he is transgressing the province allotted to him by God.

We greatly doubt whether, when both sides come to explain themselves, there will be found any essential difference between these writers and ourselves. Yet we would with great respect entreat them to consider whether they are not sanctioning a mode of speech which in other times may have been comparatively harmless, but which is now full of peril. We would entreat them to consider whether their statement be not such that an acute and logical anti-Catholic, who should take it



nakedly and in the abstract, might carry it forward into consequences from which they themselves would recoil in horror.

For ourselves, as the text of our discussion and the warrant of our doctrine, we start with a passage from Gregory XVI.'s well-known Encyclical, "*Mirari vos.*" It is difficult to imagine words which shall be more explicit and unmistakable :—

But in regard to those good wishes which we put forth for the common safety both of Church and State, may the princes, our most dear children in Christ, forward those wishes by their power and authority ; which power and authority let them regard as conferred on them, not only for the world's government, but *most of all for the Church's protection.* Let them carefully consider that whatever labour is expended for the Church's welfare tends really to their own power and tranquillity ; and let them esteem it a great privilege (we say with Pope St. Leo) if to their diadem there be also added from the Lord's hand the crown of faith. *Placed as they are in the position of parents and guardians to their peoples,* they will procure for those peoples true, permanent, and profitable rest and tranquillity, if they apply themselves *chiefly* to this care ; viz., that religion and piety towards God may be securely preserved.\*

It will conduce to the reader's convenience, if, before we begin our argument, we state briefly the conclusions to which that argument will be directed. They are substantially these. The Church was founded exclusively for a spiritual end, and her province is the administration of spirituals ; civil government was instituted immediately for a certain temporal end, and its province is the administration of temporals : but the Catholic ruler will act more laudably in proportion as he shall more earnestly endeavour to administer temporals in the way most conducive to his subjects' moral and spiritual welfare. It is always to be understood, indeed, that his labours for that welfare must be carried on throughout in profound deference and subordination to the Church's guidance. Yet we do not base our conclusion on any theory concerning the Church's direct temporal power, and concerning any delegation on her part of

---

\* *Cœterum communibus hisce votis, pro rei et sacræ et publicæ incolunitate, charissimi in Christo filii nostri viri principes suâ faveant ope et auctoritate ; quam sibi collatam considerent, non solum ad mundi regimen, sed maxime ad Ecclesiæ præsidium. Animadvertant sedulò, pro illorum imperio et quiete geri, quicquid pro Ecclesiæ salute laboratur ; immò pluris sibi suadeant fidei causam esse debere quam regni ; magnumque sibi esse perpendant, dicimus cum S. Leone pontifice, "si ipsorum diademati de manu Domini etiam fidei addatur corona." Positi quasi parentes et tutores populorum, veram, constantem, opulentam iis quietem parient et tranquillitatem, si in eam potissimum curam incumbant, ut incolumis sit religio et pietas in Deum, qui habet scriptum in femore, Rex regum et Dominus dominantium.*

such power to the Catholic ruler; but we base it on grounds totally distinct from this. What so many eminent theologians have so ably said on the Church's indirect temporal power over Christian princes we neither affirm nor deny; we are contented with the fact that our own reasoning will be altogether independent of that controverted question. We maintain that the civil governor as such, Catholic or non-Catholic, acts more laudably the more earnestly he labours, in his administration of temporals, to advance his subjects' highest good, so far as he is himself cognisant of such good.\* And we consider the Catholic ruler as constituting one particular case to which this general principle should be applied.†

We are quite convinced, indeed, not only that the civil governor acts laudably in promoting his people's highest good, but that to some limited extent he is under the *obligation* of doing so. This, however, is a separate and subsequent question, which we shall not consider at present. Whenever, therefore, we say that the civil governor *should* pursue a spiritual end, we do not necessarily imply that he is under the obligation of doing so, but only that such a course is more laudable. And this statement of itself is amply sufficient to bring us into direct conflict with our opponents; for they hold that if he pursue such an end at all in his political capacity, he is transgressing the province assigned to him by God. They therefore *are* speaking of *obligation*: they must say, if they would be consistent, that he is under the actual obligation of using every effort that his political measures may be in no degree influenced by any consideration for spiritual good as such.

We begin with certain preliminary explanations—of which some indeed are mere definitions, and none will be seriously controverted, but which it is of extreme importance that we carefully bear in mind.

By the *temporal good* of a community is understood a possession of the various external necessities, comforts, and conveniences of life. Protection of person and property ranks among the chief of these; and this includes, in its very idea, that justice shall be purely administered and easily accessible. Other temporal goods will be such as these: that

---

\* When we use the phrase "cognisant" in this and similar passages, we do not mean, "so far as he, *in fact*, knows such good," but "so far as he has *full means* of knowing it."

† It is for this reason that we profess to treat on the "*intrinsic end* of civil government;" viz., on that end which falls within its intrinsic sphere, apart from any theory of a delegated power.

honest industry shall securely obtain full sufficiency of food and clothing for the family; that adequate medical advice shall be readily obtainable by all, in case of sickness or bodily injury; that locomotion and correspondence by letter shall be as easy and expeditious as possible; that intellectual gratifications shall be widely enjoyed; that literature, the fine arts, and other things which similarly conduce to the embellishment of life, shall be in a flourishing state, and a taste for them widely diffused; that healthy diversions shall abound; &c. Under the head of temporal good, we must also rank *external liberty*, so called to distinguish it from *internal liberty*,—the self-determining power with which man's will is endowed. By external liberty we mean the power of each citizen, without external control, to carry out his various wishes and resolves. External liberty, again, may be divided into *political* and *social* liberty, accordingly as the external restraint from which we are free is, on the one hand, a restraint enforced by law, or, on the other hand, a restraint enforced by the pressure of public opinion. External liberty can never absolutely exist, for there must always be some restraint on the citizen's volitions; and, again, what degree of external liberty conduces to moral and spiritual good, is a question depending altogether on circumstances. But so far forth as external liberty exists, in that proportion undoubtedly temporal good is increased; for such liberty is a great addition to the external comforts and conveniences of life.

As to *moral and spiritual good*, the meaning of this term is sufficiently evident for our present purpose, without any attempt at more accurate definition. A large portion of this good is cognisable and demonstrable as such by reason; though it is a very different question how far unassisted reason could, in fact, have discovered it. A large portion of it, however, including of course the whole supernatural order, is known only by revelation. One further remark should here be made. It is a truth demonstrable by unassisted reason, that no human act can be morally good, except so far as its motive is pure; and that we are more pleasing to our Creator, in proportion as we possess in greater degree the habitual interior disposition of conforming ourselves to His will and preference.

Next, as to the constitution and authority of civil government:

1. If men are to rise from a state of barbarism and savage conflict, if they are to live together even in tolerable ease and tranquillity, it is absolutely necessary that in any given place there shall be some one authority, having so much physical power at its command as to render permanent resistance hopeless. If there be no one authority thus transcendent in

physical power, the peace and tranquillity of society will be disturbed to the very foundation by each man's conflict with his neighbours. On the other hand, if there be more than one body thus pre-eminent in strength, peace and tranquillity will be hardly less disturbed by the conflict of such bodies with each other. Civil war, if prolonged for any length of time, is nothing less than an inchoate relapse into anarchy; and the same thing may truly be said of protracted invasion, so far as regards the particular region occupied by invaders.

2. A state of barbarism and anarchy is so manifestly and so very deeply injurious to men's best and highest interests, that no other proof is needed to show the Divine origin and sanction of civil government. Apart from the evils of anarchy in the intellectual and material order,\* its moral results are most disastrous. Consider, *e.g.*, how the Church's action is paralysed in proportion as civil tranquillity is disturbed. The orderly and regular training of children, nay, all systematic instruction of the flock, is rendered impossible. Approach to the sacraments, which our corrupt nature makes sufficiently distasteful in itself, encounters a fresh and tremendous obstacle in the prevalent turbulence. Self-will and hatred of restraint, those evil passions which poison the very principle of religious obedience, grow up with unrestrained violence.† That interior recollectedness, which is the one atmosphere wherein grace raises the soul towards perfection, becomes a thousandfold more difficult, from the unceasing alarms and agitations of the period.

3. This one authority having so much physical power at its command as to render permanent resistance hopeless, is, of course, the civil government. It may be vested absolutely in one prince; or a number of persons may have an integral share in its administration. In the latter case, there must be certain defined relations between those who have a share in it, according to which the supreme authority is exercised; and the sum of all these various relations is the political constitution. In these islands, *e.g.*, every member of parliament, nay, in strictness, every voter, possesses an integral share in the

---

\* The temporal evils of anarchy are admirably stated in the introduction to S. Thomas's work "*De Regimine Principum*," and also by Molina, "*De Jure et Justitia*," tract 2, d. 22, à n. 8. For the latter quotation we are indebted to Dr. Murray's most valuable *Treatise on Education*, in the second volume of his "*Annual Miscellany*."

† *Quamvis juris prudentia justitiam civilem non excedat, utpote quæ manum tantum per se cohibeat, attamen ea maxime prodest ut justitia, moralis et spiritualis, quæ cor ipsum attingit, perficiatur.*—Giunchi, "*De Intellectu*," n. 67.

government—greater or less, of this or that kind, as the case may be. And here occurs one very obvious truth, which it is of extreme importance to remember. Whatever be the true principles on which the ruler, when absolute, should conduct his legislation and administration, these are the very same principles on which each individual ruler should exercise his political functions, in cases where the government is mixed. Or, to put it more specifically: if it be laudable that a Catholic absolute prince shall direct his legislation to his country's spiritual welfare, it must be laudable, in the same sense and in the same degree, that a Catholic member of the British Parliament shall give such votes as may best promote the spiritual well-being of the British empire. In the following pages, then, whenever we use the words "ruler," "civil governor," "prince,"—it must be understood that we include under that name every one possessing any share in the civil government of any state, so far as regards the exercise of his political functions.

4. From what has been said, it follows that the immediate end for which God has instituted civil government is the protection of person and property; or, as theologians sometimes express it, the preservation of exterior peace. A man, or body of men, who should give no protection to person or property, would have no claim to the very title of civil government. A civil government which should in some small degree preserve exterior peace, but should not have sufficient power to do so with reasonable completeness, is, as it were, an infant and immature government. A civil government which has power sufficient for that purpose but fails to use it, is *ipso facto* tyrannical and unjust. The preservation of exterior peace is a duty appertaining characteristically to the civil government; appertaining to it in a certain special sense, in which no other duties can possibly appertain to it.

It will be asked how this statement can be reconciled with our doctrine that the State's highest and most admirable function is to promote moral and spiritual good. The inquiry is most reasonable; and before concluding our article, we will give to it a definite and, we think, most satisfactory reply. Here we make but one remark. We have seen that the immediate end for which God instituted government is the preservation of exterior peace; but it by no means follows from this, that the ultimate end contemplated by God, even in its primary institution, is solely or chiefly the promotion of temporal good. Exterior peace is in itself, no doubt, a temporal good; but it is most vitally important, as we have already seen, for a country's spiritual advancement. Since, therefore, God regards spiritual good as immeasurably preferable to temporal, it follows that

His primary institution of civil government is chiefly, though of course not exclusively, for an ultimate spiritual end.

So much for preliminaries. In commencing our argument, we must bear in mind what we have already said on the necessity of avoiding Scylla no less than Charybdis. We will begin, therefore, by enumerating those methods of promoting spiritual good which (by consent of every Catholic) are beyond the State's competence; and in each case we will also give a reason for such incompetence.

The civil governor has no authority whatever of spiritual legislation. Under this term we include two things. Part of our meaning is, that he has no authority of ecclesiastical legislation. He has no authority to command what vestments or ceremonies shall be used at mass; or under what conditions priests shall be ordained; or who shall have power to hear confessions; &c., &c. The meaning and the ground of this statement are so obvious that another word would be superfluous.

But further, he has no authority of what we may call directly moral and religious legislation. Here it is necessary that our readers shall clearly understand the distinction which we intend between that *directly* moral and religious legislation which is beyond the civil governor's authority, and that *indirectly* moral and religious legislation which we maintain to be his highest and most admirable function. As this is one of those distinctions which are far better understood by example than by definition, we will give our examples first and our definitions afterwards.

Let us make, therefore, the supposition that the civil governor issues a law requiring me to say so many prayers at such periods, or to fast so often in the week, all for my soul's good; and let us further suppose that some theorist were to start up and maintain that I am bound in conscience to obey such a law. In proportion as I practically feel the sacredness of that charge with which God has entrusted me, the care of my own moral and spiritual culture; in proportion as I feel the absolute necessity, in order to that culture, of preserving the individuality of my own inward development free from all intrusive circumscription, — in that proportion should I protest most earnestly and emphatically against this atrocious theory. What! shall the sacred and intimate relations which exist between my Creator and myself be invaded by a meddling and intrusive government? Shall I be coerced as to my very prayers and meditations by an authority which thus takes on itself the most awfully responsible of duties, and does not so much as claim any special light or discernment for its due performance? Other tyrannies may cause,



and, in fact, have caused, much greater suffering than this; but none surely, was ever in principle so monstrous and outrageous.

It is most true, indeed, that the Catholic Church does claim the very authority which is here in question. And we fully admit that no one duly penetrated with such considerations as the above could legitimately submit to that authority, except for the Church's distinctive claims. No right-minded person, we say, could possibly submit to the Church's legislation on such subjects, were he not thoroughly convinced (as every Catholic, of course, *is* thoroughly convinced) that she has received a direct commission from God to enact such laws, and that she is accordingly guided by Divine light and grace, in a most special degree, towards the fulfilment of her office. And experience most amply bears out what the Catholic antecedently expects. For nothing is more remarkable than the singular moderation with which the Church has ever exercised her office of directly moral and religious legislation, and the ample scope given within her communion for every variety of individual development. On this head none can speak with greater feeling and emphasis, than those who have escaped from the crushing tyranny of some sect into the happy liberty of God's favoured children.\*

Next, for our example of indirectly moral and religious legislation. Let us suppose that the government imposes on me a tax for the advancement of some purely spiritual end; an end, moreover, if you please, with which I am entirely out of sympathy. It is by no means enough to say that those objections which exist against the former kind of legislation, do not hold *equally* against this: they do not hold against it in the very slightest degree. I may grumble heartily, indeed, at having to pay such a tax; but it no more tends to interfere, ever so slightly, with my private religious practices and habits, than if the tax were levied for some unwise and expensive war against France or Russia. Nay, and it is just as probable that I may thoroughly dislike the secular as the spiritual purpose to which the public money is applied.

When we say, then, that the civil governor has no power of directly moral and religious legislation, we mean that he has no power of commanding religious or ascetical exercises

---

\* Nothing contained in the text forbids us from thinking, and we do think, that under certain circumstances, and in a certain state of society, the civil governor may properly and usefully punish the transgressors of ecclesiastical laws. But we would earnestly maintain that such power should never be exercised except at the Church's solicitation, and, as it were, under her very eye.

as such. Or, putting the matter more accurately, we may express it thus. He has no power of commanding interior acts either directly or indirectly;\* nor yet of commanding such external acts as do not conduce to his end (whether that end be spiritual or temporal), except in virtue of the interior acts which should accompany them. Suppose, *e.g.*, that the State enjoined the recitation (even in private) of certain prayers, or the observance of certain fasts, in order to obtain from God the most purely temporal good. Such legislation is directed to a purely temporal end; and yet every Catholic would at once feel that it is absolutely null and void. And this very fact, indeed, gives a certain indication that, according to Catholic instincts, the distinction between the two provinces of ecclesiastical and civil legislation turns rather on the intrinsic character of the thing commanded, than on the end to which the legislation is directed.†

Such, then, is the kind of legislation, which, by consent of all Catholics, is totally beyond the province of civil government. By "indirectly moral and religious legislation" is meant the making laws which do not partake at all of the above character; but which, nevertheless, are framed, directly and expressly, for promoting the moral and spiritual good of a community, or of some portion thereof. That this latter kind of legislation is most fully within the State's province, and is, indeed, its most admirable function, is the main thesis of our article.

In regard, then, to the ground on which we base the State's incompetence for directly moral and religious legislation, two things should be observed. Firstly, we do not at all

\* It is, perhaps, the more common opinion of theologians that the Church has not the power of directly commanding interior acts; but all teach that indirectly she may command most important ones. Thus, in commanding annual confession, she indirectly commands the eliciting, at least once a year, true attrition for sin. See Suarez, "*De Legibus*," l. 4, c. 12, 13. See also the 14th proposition condemned by Alexander VII., with Viva's comment. It is, perhaps, hardly worth while to mention that, in one (rather forced) sense, it may be said that the State *can* command indirectly interior acts; viz., that if it issues a just law and one not purely penal, certain interior acts become thereby morally evil; such *e.g.* as the intention of violating this law. See Suarez, "*De Legibus*" l. 3, c. 13, n. 9. We have exactly given Suarez's doctrine; but his expression is somewhat different. He says that civil laws can command interior acts *indirectly*, viz., in the sense above explained; but that ecclesiastical laws can command them also *concomitantly*, viz., as accompanying the external acts which she directly commands.

† *Licet potestas politica et ejus lex dicantur temporales ratione objecti, quia versantur circa temporalia et externa, tamen in se res sunt spirituales.* —Bellarmine, "*De Laicis*," c. 11, n. 16.

derive our argument from the circumstance that *the Church* has been commissioned for that purpose. This circumstance, indeed, would in itself have been a sufficient ground for our conclusion; but even had the case been otherwise, had God founded no Church at all, our own reasoning would remain in all its force. That reasoning rests on the fact that no special light and grace have ever been promised to the civil governor for the discharge of so unspeakably momentous a function. So long as this is the case, there could not be a more revolting and monstrous tyranny than his attempting any such interference with the individual's religious habits. Neither, secondly, do we found our reasoning on the principle that the State, being founded for a natural end, may not pursue supernatural good. We do not admit such a principle; but even if we did, it would be quite irrelevant. God was, of course, perfectly free to raise men, or not to raise them, into the supernatural order; and we may most easily, therefore, make the supposition that He had not. He might none the less have given us external aids of the natural order, whereby we might have abundant moral power to advance indefinitely, both in purity of moral intention and in love for our Creator.\* Had this been the course of His Providence, the advancing in these virtues would have been the advancing to a purely natural end; and yet it would have been no less true in that case than it is now, that the civil government would act with intolerable tyranny in presuming to put forth any directly moral and religious legislation.

Here, then, is one province from which the State is wholly excluded,—the province of spiritual legislation. Under this head are included (1) ecclesiastical, and (2) directly moral and religious legislation.

But there is a second office for which every Catholic ruler will also acknowledge his incompetence. He will not presume to undertake the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth: whether by authoritatively declaring what he regards as such, and denouncing what he regards as error; or by delegating ministers and officers for the purpose of enforcing such truth on the hearts and consciences of the people. He well knows that God has instituted the Church for the express purpose of doing both these things; and that he is presumptuously encroaching on her territory if he attempts them. It will, indeed, be his highest and most

---

\* The Church has condemned, in Baius's 34th proposition, the notion that there cannot imaginably be a natural love of God external to the supernatural order.

admirable function (we consider) to assist her in the performance of her work by the various political means at his disposal; but all such assistance must, of course, be given in most complete subordination and submission to her supreme authority.

A question here arises. It is easily imaginable that some ruler may be invincibly ignorant of the Church's just claims: how far will he act laudably in attempting the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth (so far as he is cognisant of such truth) among the mass of his people? We speak here under correction and with diffidence; but we incline to the opinion that he *will* act laudably by making the attempt, within certain limits which need not be here specified.\* At the same time we confidently maintain that he would find the task filled with every kind of anxiety and difficulty; and that a Catholic prince may well felicitate himself on being wholly free from this overwhelming responsibility. It is not necessary, however, for our ensuing argument, to enter further on this particular question; and we will, therefore, altogether waive the conclusion to which we ourselves incline. We will admit for argument's sake in the case of a prince inculpably non-Catholic, what is so undeniably true in the case of a Catholic, that he has no concern with the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth.

We have now, then (as appears to us), exhausted the legitimate meaning of Catholics, when they say that the civil government is excluded from the sphere of spirituals. Firstly, the ruler has no power of spiritual legislation, whether ecclesiastical or directly moral and religious. Secondly, he has no concern with the direct maintenance and propagation of religious truth. And thirdly, whatever a Catholic prince does for the promotion of spiritual good, must be done in complete subordination and submission to the Church's authority. Since, then, he is excluded from this more directly spiritual sphere of action, his province may with great propriety be called temporal. It should further be added (though we cannot here enlarge on the subject), that there are various important rights of family and of property, which are also *de jure* sacred from his interference. But such offices as the following, by consent of all, appertain to the civil governor. It is his proper function to take all necessary means for protecting person and property; to lay down the rules and standards of judicial

---

\* *Agendum est de cultu divino, ad quem reges et principes studere debent toto conatu et sollicitudine tanquam ad finem debitum.*—S. Thomas, "*De Regimine Principum*," l. 2, c. 16.

procedure; to determine what acts shall be treated as punishable offences, and with what kind and degree of punishment; to levy taxes in this or that degree and method; to administer the public money in this way or that; to determine peace and war; to enforce this or that degree of restraint, in this or that way, against the publicly advocating this or that doctrine, whether religious or secular; &c., &c. Nor can any one doubt that extremely great service or disservice may be done to the nation's spiritual good, according to the use made of these most extensive powers. It is, therefore, a most momentous question, how far he should regulate his political acts by a consideration of such welfare. Our opponents maintain that he violates his duty by doing so at all; we maintain, on the contrary, that he acts more laudably in proportion as he does so more energetically: and on this question issue is to be joined.

We will thus express our fundamental thesis: The intrinsic end which should be pursued by a civil governor in his political action is the highest good of his people; and predominantly, therefore, their moral and spiritual welfare, so far as he is cognisant of such welfare. Nor does any thing need explanation here, except the word "predominantly." We are not, then, at all denying that in a great number of cases the ruler may work for temporal good without in any way injuring spiritual; and in all such cases he cannot do better than devote his whole political energy to the achievement of such good. But whenever the two do appear to clash, we maintain that the spiritual good should *predominate*. And this, of course, is Gregory the Sixteenth's meaning, when by implication he exhorts Catholic princes to give their care *chiefly* (*potissimum*) to the security of religion. He does not mean that the greatest part of their time, their attention, their actual thought should be given to the security of religion; but that whenever (apparent) temporal good clashes with the security of religion, the latter should take precedence of the former.

We will next supplement our fundamental thesis by a second; which applies the general principle contained in the first to the particular case of a Catholic ruler: Every civil governor who has full means of knowing the Church's Divine authority, is under the obligation of estimating his people's spiritual good according to her doctrine; and of promoting it (so far as he does promote it) in complete and constant subordination to her authority and guidance.\* This thesis

---

\* Quia igitur vitæ, quâ in præsentî benè vivimus, finis est beatitudo cœlestis, ad regis officium pertinet eâ ratione vitam multitudinis bonam procurare

must of course be regarded as axiomatic, by all those who believe that the Catholic Church really is what she claims to be.

We must hasten, however, to append one or two explanations of our meaning. Our first thesis in particular might lead to the suspicion that we have some tenderness for a certain theory, or practice, which none can abhor more sincerely than ourselves. We allude to that view of the State's autocratic authority which leads the government, in various parts of Europe, to aim at overriding all other influences; to interfere, with vexatious minuteness, in the details of daily life; and to repress by a crushing tyranny the free development of man's individuality. But it really seems to us that we are able on our principles to make a more effective stand against this most odious form of State tyranny than our opponents can on theirs. For it is our very principle that the State should ever consider the people's highest good; and their highest good (in the present state of European civilization) is fatally thwarted and impeded by such a system of stringent repression and restraint.

Again, we are neither expressing nor implying any opinion on such questions as these: the directness and frequency with which any Catholic prince should press religion on the attention of his subjects; the degree of repression (if any) which he should exercise in regard to anti-Catholic or irreligious books; the position which he should assume towards his non-Catholic subjects; &c., &c. It is indeed quite impossible, if we wished it, to make any kind of general statement on these heads: for those very enactments which are most salutary under one set of circumstances may at another time, or in another place, be absolutely fatal to the best interests of religion. And we most willingly admit that an individual prince may—

*secundum quod congruit ad celestem beatitudinem consequendam, ut scilicet ea precipiat quæ ad celestem beatitudinem ducunt, et eorum contraria, secundum quod fuerit possibile, interdicat. Quæ autem sit ad veram beatitudinem via, ex lege divinâ cognoscitur, cujus doctrina pertinet ad sacerdotium.*—*S. Thomas, "De Regimine Principum,"* l. 1, c. 15.

*Finis ad quem principaliter rex intendere debet in seipso et in subditis est eterna beatitudo quæ in visione Dei consistit. . . . tunc optime regit, si talis in ipso sit finis intentus.*—*Ibid.* l. 3, c. 3.

*Si temporalis administratio impedit spirituale bonum, omnium judicio tenetur princeps temporalis mutare illum modum administrandi. etiam cum detrimento temporalis boni.*—*Bellarmino, "De Summo Pontifice,"* l. 5, c. 7, n. 5.

*Secundus error est aliorum, qui ad alterum extremum deflectentes, dicunt reges debere curare rempublicam suam et pacem publicam, de religione autem non curare; sed permittere singulis ut sentiant prout voluerint et vivant ut voluerint, modo non perturbent pacem publicam. . . . Hic error perniciosissimus est.*—*Bellarmino, "De Laicis,"* c. 18, n. 1, 3.



not indeed be too earnest in his anxiety to draw his people towards God (for this we hold to be impossible), but—be extremely unwise and injudicious in the means which he adopts for that end. We only maintain that this should be his predominant end; and that he abdicates his highest function if he confines his efforts to the promotion of their temporal good.

Lastly, our readers may fear that our first thesis may be wrested by a Protestant government to a bad purpose, and be made a pretext for persecuting the true religion. We mention this objection thus early for the purpose of guarding against that prejudice which would reasonably arise if it were thought that we had not carefully considered it. In a future article we hope to meet it fully and in detail.

Such are our explanations. And the precise principle at issue will be more clearly seen if we contemplate it, not in abstract statement, but in actual operation. Now our opponents represent their view as one of great practical moment; they imply, therefore, that the cases are neither infrequent nor unimportant in which the pursuit of spiritual good would lead the government in one direction, and the pursuit of temporal good in another. How far and in what sense we agree with this will very soon appear; for the present we will take for granted their implied statement, and by its help illustrate the proposition for which they contend. Let us suppose, then, some such case to arise. One line of policy will best promote the nation's spiritual good, but another will be more advantageous for its temporal welfare. Moreover, some given person, who either wields the whole authority of government or has some assignable share in it—say, *e.g.*, a member of the British Parliament—is thoroughly convinced of this fact. According to our opponents, his one most laudable course is to put forth his whole political action and influence for the *latter* of these two policies; because, in their view, by aiming at spiritual good in any part of his political conduct, he transgresses his province and violates a strict obligation. But, according to the doctrine which we earnestly maintain, his political conduct should be the very reverse of this; he should labour no less earnestly as a politician than as a man to gain for his country what he believes to be its highest good.

We really find it difficult to imagine what further argument can be needed on this alternative than thus openly to state it. According to the opposite view, a civil governor acts more laudably by putting forth his whole political influence towards inflicting on his country the gravest injury: for can any injury be graver than that its highest good should be sacrificed to a lower? In fact, according to them, he is altogether to separate

(by some inexplicable process) his political and his personal action. In his private capacity he should strain every nerve in one direction, but all his votes and political influence are to be thrown into the opposite scale. One really has a right to insist upon some very demonstrative evidence before one can even give a hearing to so paradoxical a proposition. On a question, however, of such moment we must not think of thus settling the matter, as it were, by a stroke of the pen; we must draw out in some detail our own argument, and consider in some detail our opponents' objections. And these opponents, as has been already implied, belong to two most widely different classes.

When politicians and men of the world indignantly deny our thesis, what they practically mean is, that their own whole interest lies with the temporal and not with the spiritual order. Now, if any such men distinctly disown belief in the One True God, we have no controversy with *them* on the present occasion; in general, however, they shrink from any such denial. But there cannot in the whole world be a tenet more monstrous and unblushing than that God indeed exists, but that temporal interests are even commensurable in importance with religious. These men, therefore, are compelled in theory to admit the superior claim of the latter; and since (from their hatred of spirituals) their political conduct is entirely directed to secular ends, they are driven to take refuge in the theory that the State has no concern with religious truth. They profess, then, under compulsion, that very doctrine, which our theological opponents (if we may so call them) feel from the very bottom of their hearts; viz., that religious well-being is immeasurably more important than temporal. It so happens, therefore, that both classes of our opponents, vast as is really the gulf which separates them, may be met formally by the same course of reasoning. And if, in any part of our argument, we may seem to speak disparagingly and severely of those with whom we are at issue, we earnestly entreat our theological opponents to bear in mind, once for all, that *they* form no part whatever of that class against which such language is directed. We should, indeed, take to ourselves most serious blame, if we said any thing which, even by implication, could be construed into the slightest want of respect for *them*; but we should hardly take to ourselves less blame, if we either expressed or implied any feeling milder than that of detestation and abhorrence, in regard to the principles of those worldly and political antagonists against whom we also contend.

Our first course of reasoning shall be of a negative character.

We will contend that there is no imaginable doctrine, differing from our own, which our opponents can steadily look in the face and embrace as theirs, so long as they remain true to their profession ; so long as they recognize the immeasurably superior importance which attaches to spiritual over temporal well-being.

Since so much is said of temporal good as the highest intrinsic end of civil government, we have a right to ask at the outset whether government is to pursue the nation's permanent and abiding, or merely its proximate and immediate, temporal good. If the former, we reply at once that there is no way of really promoting its permanent and abiding temporal good, except by advancing its spiritual welfare ; and a little consideration will make this abundantly manifest.

The great majority of every nation are the lowest and poorest class ; and they are also those who, from their helplessness and feebleness, have the greatest claim on government for help and consideration. The temporal good, then, of the whole community will be best promoted, if the poor are contented, sober, industrious, and loyal, while the rich are disinterestedly and prudently benevolent ; if the laws are so administered that the poorest shall have equal security for their right with the richest ; if politicians, whether speculative or active, give up all self-seeking and ambition, give up all exclusive regard to class interests, and devote themselves with pure intention, with untiring zeal, with their whole intellectual resources, to the material well-being of the masses. Facts will at best, alas ! be ever miserably below such an ideal as this ; but so far as it is even distantly approached, an amount of temporal good will accrue to the great majority, in comparison with which all benefits arising from free trade, or railway extension, or postal facilities, or commercial treaties, are literally but as dust in the balance. Supposing, therefore, that the highest legitimate end of civil government were the permanent and abiding promotion of temporal good, such is the picture which a ruler should ever keep before his mind : to this purpose should he direct his chief policy, that future generations shall be trained in such habits as we have just described. But in this direction he is powerless to advance one step, he stands as it were helpless and paralyzed, unless he call to his aid the agencies of pure religion.

We have no wish to colour or exaggerate ; we admit most freely that though the rich were actuated by the purest benevolence which love of God could engender, such benevolence would fail grievously of its legitimate result, unless it were

directed by a careful, intelligent, laborious investigation of social facts and principles. By all means, therefore, we say, let government do all which it legitimately can to promote such intellectual habits. But though benevolence can do little without intelligence, intelligence can do nothing without benevolence. And the growth of such self-sacrificing, disinterested benevolence among the educated can only be promoted, as a general rule, by their steady growth in true piety. Sentimental and transitory benevolence, nay, a few generous efforts for a few definite objects, may often enough be found in irreligious men. But a steady, sustained, self-sacrificing preference for the community's temporal well-being over their own and that of their class,—this can only be obtained by that love of man which is founded on love of God. Yet it is most unquestionably on such benevolence as this that the permanent temporal good of a community predominantly depends.\* Now great as are the mutual differences of those who profess the Christian name, there is one point at least on which all agree; viz., that whatever religion be simply true and from God, it is that, far more than any other, which will engender disinterested love of our fellow-creatures. So that if it be the office of civil government to promote permanent and abiding temporal good, it is no less its office to promote pure and true religion.

We are also brought to the same conclusion by a different road. Our opponents mention, as one advantage of their theory, that, if it be once admitted, the co-operation of discordant religionists in the same civil government becomes comparatively easy. This, however, is plainly quite a mistake, so far as regards that particular form of their theory which we are now noticing. Every good Catholic will think that the extension of Catholicism is the best possible means of advancing his country's temporal welfare. Protestants, on their side, are equally unanimous in regarding the prevalence of Catholicism as most hostile to material interests; they hold it as certain, that our holy religion (so far as it is diffused) will assuredly produce habits of laziness and disorder, and promote a retrograde movement from all the blessings of modern civilization. Whether, therefore, it be the Catholic or the Protestant legislator who considers that his highest political

\* The Church, by fixing public and private morality on its only sure and permanent basis, religion; by promoting that charity, purity, forbearance, disinterestedness, which is the natural effect of a religious estimate of the vanity of this world; becomes the most powerful auxiliary of the State . . . in establishing peace, order, submission to lawful authority, general security. — *Dr. Murray On Education*, p. 303.

end should be the country's permanent temporal good,—in either case he will regard it as an integral part of his legislative functions to give his own religion every legitimate advantage over its rivals.\*

And while this version of our opponents' theory possesses every evil which they can possibly attribute to ours, it possesses other evils also exclusively its own. One of these is so important as to deserve distinct mention. If a Catholic legislator understands that by entering Parliament he undertakes a serious spiritual responsibility; that he has a sacred duty to perform towards the highest good of his fellow-countrymen; such considerations would tend to exercise an elevating and sanctifying influence over his character. But suppose him to be taught that he should promote indeed the Church's spiritual interests, yet only as one *means* towards the temporal prosperity of Great Britain and Ireland; that, in his political capacity, he is bound to aim at the higher good in no other way than as an instrument to the lower;—such teaching must tend utterly to perplex and bewilder him.

Our opponents, then, if they remain such, will have to reply that government should aim, not at permanent and abiding, but only at proximate and immediate, temporal good. In other words, they will say that its functions begin and end with the protection of person and property against domestic and foreign aggression; that it should simply take such measures as are most effective for that end; and that the nation's growth in temporal no less than in spiritual good must be left to individual agency. This is the well-known *laissez-faire* theory, which was very popular in England some years ago, and which is still not without its advocates.† In order that we may appreciate its merits, let us pass under review some few universally admitted functions of government, and consider how such a theory would guide it in the performance of such functions.

1. Every State must, by absolute necessity, lay down some law or other in regard to marriage. This fact is plain on

---

\* We are not at all implying that in our own country, or in others similarly circumstanced, Catholics and Protestants may not work together harmoniously in the Legislature; in a future article we hope to argue for the opposite conclusion. Our reasoning in the text is *ad hominem*. Our opponents maintain, that on our theory discordant religionists could never co-operate with advantage in any legislature; we reply, that if this were impossible on our theory, it would be no less so on theirs.

† The political bearings of this theory (which are beside our subject) are excellently treated by Mr. Stuart Mill in the last part of his work on Political Economy; though we do not, of course, adopt all his conclusions.

various grounds. Firstly, the State does not fulfil its primary function of protecting person and property, unless it gives me full protection in my family relations ; but in order to do this, it must decide who *is* my wife and which *is* my family. Then, secondly, everyone counts among the State's necessary functions the enforcing legal contracts. It must by absolute necessity, then, treat either as legal or illegal a quasi-matrimonial contract between two persons while another wife or husband is still alive ; or between two persons who are within certain degrees of kindred or affinity. The civil governor, we say, must follow some system or other on the marriage relation. What shall that system be, and on what grounds shall it be chosen ? Our opponents must say that he should choose that system which will be most effective in protecting the nation against immediate tumults and disorders ; and that he goes beyond his province if he allows any other consideration whatever to influence his legislation. Is there anyone who will gravely uphold such a tenet as this ?

Here, however, our theological opponents will interpose a most reasonable disclaimer. They will remind us of a very essential doctrine included in their theory—viz., that no law can bind the conscience which is at variance with God's Command, and that no legislator, cognisant of the Command, can without sin enact such a law. But we have not forgotten for a moment that such is their doctrine ; nor is it at all necessary for the purpose of our argument to suppose that the State commands anything which God has forbidden. Take such a supposition, *e.g.*, as the following :—An extremely strong feeling may exist throughout some nation in favour of a second marriage being made legal where the first wife has been unfaithful. And to prevent complication, we will further suppose it not to be even contemplated that this second union should be legally enforced where either party may wish to dissolve it. Here, then, is a project of law which commands nothing forbidden by God ; which puts no pressure of any kind on those who are resolved to obey the Divine law as testified by the Church ; but whose scope is altogether different from this. This nation, again, we further suppose, is under a constitutional government, and various Catholics have a part in that government. A Catholic legislator may arrive at the clearest conviction that immediate peace and tranquillity will be very greatly promoted by the enactment of this law, because of the deep public dissatisfaction which will attend any other arrangement. Our theological opponents would surely none the less call on such a legislator to stand by his religion, and use his best political influence against the unhappy measure. Yet, we would ask them with great respect, are they not herein



admitting the very principle for which we contend? Are they not admitting that the civil governor's intrinsic end should be predominantly moral and spiritual good?

2. Next take the question of education. According to the precise theory now before us, the civil governor has no concern with children, except to prevent them from picking pockets or causing any immediate disturbance. If he is a Catholic, however personally zealous he may be to forward religious education, in his political capacity he must not move one finger to help the Church in her extremest need. He may allow private individuals, at their own charge, to do so, and he will himself do so from his private funds. But here his power ends.

3. This matter of education suggests another difficulty. No machinery is more efficacious, whether for education or various other important ends, than the endowments bestowed for those ends by private citizens. The State, however, exercises the inalienable privilege of forbidding such endowments when they are at variance with the public good; or enforcing some change of destination when, in progress of years, they become so. Now, the most mischievous doctrines imaginable do not issue in *immediate* evil: in all ordinary cases a considerable course of time elapses between the sowing of error and the reaping of misery; the poison of false doctrine is slow and gradual of operation in proportion as it is deadly. Atheism, *e.g.*, or socialism, in due time not only eats like a canker into the moral life of a community, but tends also most surely to the overthrow of temporal order and tranquillity; but no one will say that such evil effects accrue in the outset. It is only by slow degrees that the full meaning of any revolutionary doctrine is apprehended; and when it is apprehended, its practical applications are still but gradually evolved. Now, those with whom we are at present arguing maintain that the civil governor is forbidden by God to consider any future results, and is required to pursue no higher end than immediate tranquillity and good order. They may intelligibly say, then, that he should forbid all endowments; or else they may intelligibly say that he should *protect* all endowments: those which may be founded for the promotion of socialism and atheism, no less sedulously than those founded for religious education and for the mitigation of moral and physical evil. But between these alternatives, on their principle, there is no middle course.

4. A question of great social, and indeed religious, importance is much discussed at this day among speculative politicians of this and other countries. Is it desirable that property should accumulate in large masses, as in England? or is

the extremely opposite state of things preferable, which exists in France? or, lastly, is some intermediate alternative better than either? There is the greatest divergency of opinion here; but no one has ever doubted that the legislature of any country, without violating any existing right, may tend most influentially to secure either of these results. On a common-sense view the *principles* are obvious enough which the legislator should follow in dealing with this question, great as may be his difficulty in arriving at a confident *conclusion*. He must consider, in the first place, which of these various arrangements will in his own country best promote the people's spiritual and temporal good; and having thus determined his end, he will consult political economy and other kindred sciences to furnish him with the means of carrying it out. He will use, of course, all due prudence in refraining from any sudden change of policy; but he will set himself to inaugurate a steady course of legislation tending to the desired result. Now, according to the theory which we are opposing, the whole of this is one continued transgression of his legitimate province. He is bound to legislate haphazard and in the dark, so far as regards the future distribution of property: his one only concern is to defend from aggression that which now exists.

5. On the same theory, the State has no authority to suppress the publication of flagitious and abominable books, &c.; for, fearfully as they injure the soul, no one can maintain that they interfere with complete present security for person and property.

6. The power of inflicting capital punishment is necessarily vested in the civil governor for protection of human life: he has been entrusted by God with the awful power of cutting short an immortal soul's period of probation and opportunity for repentance. What is to be said of the proposition that it is his bounden duty to exercise that power on each occasion, without any reference whatever to the welfare of that soul? nay, without any reference whatever to the effects which may be produced on public morality, or on individual and national character? What is to be said of the proposition that God, who has bestowed on him this tremendous commission, has strictly commanded him to exercise it without regard to any other end than the immediate preservation of tranquillity and good order?—a truly suggestive question, which we hope our readers will pursue into its various details.

We might fill the whole number with further illustrations; but we have said quite enough to make clear the bearing of our argument, and must therefore pass on. We will merely pause one moment to sum up what has been hitherto urged.

Certain thinkers maintain that the civil governor's intrinsic end should be temporal good and nothing higher. These men are speaking either of permanent, or of immediate, temporal good. If of the former, it is inseparably and inextricably mixed up with spiritual good ; if of the latter, they are landed in conclusions from which common sense and common feeling recoil.

A third hypothesis may be imagined, differing from the two former, and yet falling short of our own conclusions. It may be held that a ruler should promote among his people those principles of morality which reason by itself can recognize ; but that all attempt at the practical advancement of revealed religion is an impertinent deviation from his allotted sphere. To estimate this hypothesis, let us first consider what *are* those principles of morality which reason by itself can recognize.

It may be established by reason that purity, humility, forgivingness, are among the highest of virtues, and their opposites among the most heinous of sins. It may be established by reason that we were created by a Being Infinite in all Perfections. And it is a very obvious dictate of reason that, since we have been thus created, our highest duty and our highest blessedness is to love and serve Him. We grow in real virtue (so reason peremptorily declares) in proportion as we acquire a deep practical sense that the greatest possible advancement in wealth, or in power, or in intellectual cultivation, is of value immeasurably small when compared with the smallest growth in love for that Being and in readiness to hear and obey His commands.

It follows, therefore, that, on the hypothesis which we are now considering, it falls within the ruler's appointed sphere to do what in him lies for the nurture of his subjects in these admirable qualities. It falls within his sphere to do what in him lies, that his subjects may be pure, humble, and forgiving ; that they may abound in the love and fear of God ; that they may grow in a deep and practical sense of that solemn truth which we have just enunciated. It is hardly worth while to make the obvious remark that no Catholic ruler will regard any means as even possible for attaining these high objects, except the giving every encouragement and help, under the Church's guidance, to the Church's ministrations. Nor will Protestants, on their side, be behindhand in assuming that the progress of what *they* consider pure religion affords the only hope of promoting the practice of that morality which nature by itself is able indeed to recognize, but unable to fulfil.

We indulge the sanguine hope that those whom we have throughout called our theological opponents, will long ere this

have recognized a substantial agreement between their views and our own. But we have no such hope with regard to that other class with whom we are so directly at issue. Our theological opponents, if they differ from us at all, differ at least far more in expression than in substance; whereas the other class differ far more in substance even than in expression. They are hampered throughout (as we have already said) by that doctrine which they are compelled to admit speculatively, but against which, in truth, they so profoundly revolt—viz., that spirituals are immeasurably more important than temporals. When they contend so earnestly for the divorce of politics from religion, they contend, in fact, for a certain principle altogether inconsistent with the above-named doctrine, and for that very reason most congenial and most dear to them. It is an essential part, then, of our negative argument to put clearly before our readers what we believe that principle to be. We cannot, however, do so without making a few introductory remarks.

There is no more wonderful phenomenon in the whole world, though its very commonness, in fact, prevents us from wondering at it, than the way in which a great multitude of men accept Christian morality. Every Catholic will speculatively admit those moral principles mentioned by us in a previous page. He will admit that the true path of virtue lies in the way of humility, forgivingness, and indifference to the world's censure; in the constant readiness to hear and obey God's voice. Nor can a Protestant, who with any kind of sincerity accepts the Bible as his rule of faith, hold any different speculative view of true morality. And yet great numbers of these very persons, when they come across the throng of men, form their judgments of individual character on principles directly contrary. They profess speculatively that the truly virtuous man, in proportion as he is such, cares little for the world's praise and everything for God's; but in practice they admire far more highly one who is quick to discern and to resent misconstruction, and who is punctiliously jealous of *his own honour*. They profess speculatively that humility is among the highest of graces, and pride among the most heinous of sins; but when they are brought into contact with a truly humble man, they regard him as poor-spirited and chicken-hearted. They profess speculatively that he is most truly virtuous who ardently loves God, and is keenly sensitive of insults against His holy Name; but they rather recoil from such a man if they actually meet him, and they estimate far more highly one who has no keen sensitiveness at all for God's honour and glory, but who is genial, amiable, and kindly. Some qualities they admire as

virtues which are not virtues at all; and others which are truly such they admire out of all due proportion. No two things can well be more different than the morality which they speculatively profess and that which they practically hold.

On no point do these two standards of morality come into more manifest conflict than on what the two parties respectively call "patriotism." In one sense of the word, patriotism is a quality which every Christian moralist will approve. A Christian father takes a special interest in the welfare of his own children, altogether apart from that with which he regards the welfare of mankind in general. He labours in a special sense that his own children may enjoy temporal and (far more) spiritual good; and rejoices in a special sense if they do enjoy it. And in a way altogether similar, though of course far less in degree, it is at least permissible that we should take far greater interest in our own country's temporal and spiritual advancement than in that of other nations. Nay, there is a sense in which love of country is justly counted by S. Thomas as among the greatest of virtues; that love of country, namely, which "prefers the common good to personal advantage."\* Such love is exemplified wherever a citizen endures self-restraint and privation in order that he may the more largely benefit his fellow-countrymen spiritually or temporally; that he may endow, for their service, priests, or schools, or hospitals.

But far different from this is the patriotism so admired by those whom we are now criticising. The patriotic man, according to their acceptation of the term, is more interested in his country's temporal than its spiritual good, and very far more in its external glory and greatness than in either. The patriot of this stamp takes very far greater delight in a military victory achieved by his countrymen against superior force, than in the most triumphant success obtained by a Catholic missionary towards reforming their moral practice, or the most valuable improvement of medicine or of law; and this quite apart from the justice of his country's cause—simply through pride at her military prowess. Nay, so far as he does grieve over the national sins, it is far rather as being an element of national weakness than as being the offences of his loved fellow-countrymen against their Almighty Creator. It would be waste of time to set about proving what is so abundantly evident—viz., that patriotism in this sense is no virtue at all, but is merely one aspect of general worldliness and ungodliness.

---

\* *Amor patriæ in radice caritatis fundatur, quæ communia propriis, non propria communibus antepōnit.—De Regimine Principum, l. 3, c. 4.*

We say, then, that when these worldly men cry aloud that the State has no concern with spiritual interests, they by no means think of excluding from its province the promotion of that morality which they practically hold, but only of that which they speculatively profess. They pursue as politicians the very same ends which they pursue as men. In fact, they express their own doctrine far too favourably when they profess to desire that government shall devote itself to the people's temporal good. Their main desire is by no means that temporal enjoyment may be diffused and temporal suffering diminished; but rather that their country may possess that great show of military power abroad, that great display of material wealth and luxury at home, which may impress both themselves and others with the idea of national greatness. It is not their country's *good* which they seek, whether spiritual or temporal, but her supposed *greatness*. Now, our position throughout has been, that though temporal good should be subordinated to spiritual, yet the pursuit of temporal good is in itself a most legitimate and laudable function of government. But we are quite unable to say so much for pursuit of national greatness, unless, indeed, it be merely sought as a *means* for national good. In national greatness we are quite unable to see anything whatever intrinsically desirable; while we see much which is full of peril to the nation's highest good. And let this also be further observed, though we have no space to enlarge on its truth and its importance: the pursuit of national good tends to international union,\* but the pursuit of national greatness to international discord. It is from this very cause, from this proud and unchastened desire of national pre-eminence, that have arisen far the greater part of those desolating wars which have made so fearful an addition to human misery. So far from our holding that governments have cared *too much* for their people's temporal good, to our mind one of the most deplorable facts in all history is their having cared for it *so little*.

This, then, we believe to be the meaning of worldly and proud "patriots," when they would exclude religion from the sphere of politics. And to state such a doctrine is to refute it. No one who bears the Christian name can advocate such a principle of action nakedly and undisguisedly:

---

\* The various discussions on free trade, if we may trust those who have studied the subject, have put in much clearer light the very interesting and pregnant truth, that (as a general rule) we thrive temporally, not by our neighbour's adversity, but by his prosperity; and that one country's industrial success is a simple benefit to other countries.



its strength lies in the multitude of worldly men who are influenced by it unconsciously and instinctively.

One explanation must be added in this place, to prevent possible misconception. We have been saying much, as our subject has suggested, on "spiritual" and "temporal" good: we have said very little on "intellectual." It might be inferred, then, that we place our ideal of national good in the people being pious on one hand, and well fed on the other; and that we regard the progress of thought and intelligence as of little account. Certainly we should no more dream of a man being personally perfect or personally admirable for possessing intellectual good than for possessing temporal. But intellectual good, no less than temporal, is a legitimate object of desire; and it admits, even more efficaciously than temporal good, of being made instrumental to the promotion of man's true end. We hold it as most desirable for a nation's welfare, not only that vigorous and manly thought shall be devoted (under the guidance of true piety) to the service of religion, but also that good Catholics shall successfully cultivate the various branches of secular science. We say this (as we observed) to avoid possible misapprehension; but we have no space for explaining and vindicating our statement.

We have now considered (we believe) all the positions differing from our own on the State's proper attitude towards religion which have been, or imaginably can be, assumed; and the obvious untenableness of every one in the number must be regarded as no weak argument for our own conclusion. From negative proof we now proceed to positive, and put before our readers some of the direct reasons available in our favour.

1. All action of the civil government is, in fact, the corporate action of the community; and this, whether the action be directed towards one of its own members, or towards some outlying body. But each member of the community is bound in some degree to aim at spiritual good, and acts more laudably in proportion as he does so in a greater degree. What good reason can be given why that aim, which is of all the most laudable in citizens acting individually, should be absolutely forbidden to them when acting corporately? If no reason can be given, nor even imagined, our own conclusion necessarily follows.

2. The second argument which we shall give comes home still more closely to the mind. It is a first principle of natural religion that we please God better the more earnestly we employ in His service every power and every influence which we possess. But the civil ruler possesses a special and wide-

spreading influence to which no other in the secular order can bear comparison. If this general rule, then, applies to others, in quite a special and pre-eminent sense it applies to him.

3. But there is a peculiarity in his relation to the people which requires to be considered separately. A master acts laudably in promoting the spiritual good of his servant; a landlord of his tenant; a manufacturer of his workman, &c., &c. Yet it can hardly be said that in these cases one party is *responsible* for the other's spiritual good, because the relation between them was freely entered into and is dissolvable at pleasure. A good Catholic, *e. g.*, in the Southern American States, would feel responsible for the spiritual good of his slaves, in a sense quite different *in kind* from that in which an English master is responsible for the spiritual good of his servants. Yet the very slaveowner is not *supreme* over his slave, not even in the temporal order; for the State government can enact laws which regulate the relations between them. But the civil ruler has been commissioned by God to wield a physical power which is absolutely irresistible through the length and breadth of the entire land. This power has been given him for their benefit, and they are under the strict obligation of rendering hearty obedience to his just commands. It is impossible that any one of ordinary piety can be in such a position as this in regard to a great number of men, without feeling himself most deeply responsible for the promotion of their highest good.

4. And the case becomes far stronger when we consider how absolutely impossible it is that he can be neutral in regard to their spiritual welfare. We will first establish this fact, and afterwards draw out the very cogent argument which results from it. We say, then, that the civil governor cannot be spiritually neutral; that his inaction will necessarily have quite as important a moral bearing as any course of action which he can possibly adopt. There will be no space to state one hundredth part of the facts which will illustrate this proposition; but there will be ample space to prove its truth abundantly and irrefragably. And we will take our illustrations from our own country, because the instances will thus be more familiar to our readers, and will more readily convey their due force.

We may begin our survey of the State's necessary moral influence almost from the moment of a child's birth. Some months ago, a highminded and benevolent Protestant gentleman, who signs himself "S. G. O.," addressed a letter to the *Times* on what he called the "guilt-gardens" of London. His position was substantially this: "In consequence of land-owners and builders being placed under no sufficient restric-

tion in the pursuit of their own advantage, numbers of the London poor are driven into abodes most fatal to their moral interests. The squalid wretchedness of these courts is the least of their evils; their moral atmosphere is more stifling and deadly than their physical. The miserable children born there are under a certain quasi-necessity of growing up in the deepest moral darkness; their minds are utterly corrupted, even before the age of reason and education begins." It is no business of ours to inquire whether this statement is exaggerated; though we have no reason to believe that it is so. Such a state of things, at all events, is abundantly possible in any large town; nor is it denied that evils of a similar kind, though less in degree, may easily be rife in the country also. Further, the evil is one which no private benevolence can possibly remedy: the Legislature, and that alone, can arrest the plague, whether by interposing some further restraint on landowners and builders, or by exercising forcible interference in some other way. Our position, then, is, that on this matter the Legislature cannot possibly be neutral; that its *inaction* is a fact as momentous in its bearing on moral and spiritual interests as any imaginable mode of action can possibly be.

The child, in due time, reaches the age when reason begins to dawn. What education shall he receive? The government, by absolute necessity, must take one or other of the three following courses. Firstly, it may be altogether inactive in the whole matter, and even refuse giving effect to any endowment from individuals. In that case no external help will be available for educational purposes, except so much as the zeal and resources of any religious or irreligious body may furnish, as it were, from day to day. So far as this help does not extend, the poor will educate their children just as much and just as little as they can and will; the wicked will train their children in vice, and the unbelieving in unbelief. Secondly, the State may be itself inactive, but may not refuse giving effect to private educational endowments. In this case it will have to decide whether it shall give effect to all such endowments, or only to some. Shall it sanction endowments, *e. g.*, to educate children in atheism and socialism? If not, where shall the line be drawn? Shall it exclude Deistic endowments? or Unitarian? or Catholic? or shall it include all these? It cannot possibly avoid facing this question, if it sanctions endowments at all. Or, thirdly, the government may not only sanction endowments, but it may itself move actively in the matter: it may give largely from the public purse; nay, it may actually enforce a certain amount of educational training, both moral and intellectual. Any one of these three courses is pregnant

with most important results, favourable or unfavourable, to the people's spiritual good; yet the government, by logical necessity, must embrace one or other.

The child grows up to maturity, and thinks of settling in life. Here we are brought to that vitally important function of civil government which we have already mentioned—the determining what law of marriage it shall sanction and promote. And in this instance, again, the State cannot be spiritually neutral. It must sanction one marriage law or other, as we have already shown; and whichever it sanctions, most momentous results will ensue as regards the nation's moral and spiritual advancement.

Then, again, as to that particular class of offences which is specially opposed to the sanctity of marriage. The State cannot ignore them; it must deal with them one way or another. And however it deals with them, moral interests will be deeply affected for good or for evil. Consider again the publication of immoral books, &c. The inaction of government here is something very different from spiritual neutrality: it means that such productions may circulate freely among all classes of the community.

We have now said enough, we hope, to suggest a train of thought which will lead the reader much farther. At all events we have said enough, and much more than enough, to establish our proposition. The argument built on that proposition may be stated as follows:—The civil governor, we have seen, cannot escape from spiritual responsibility: do what he will, his conduct must by absolute necessity affect, for good or for evil, the highest interests of those placed by God under his rule. Now suppose he were consistently to exclude spiritual ends from all share in determining his policy. No one will be so wild as to say that by a happy accident, while aiming at mere temporal good, he will invariably, or even ordinarily, achieve spiritual. It follows, therefore, that if he did not aim at spiritual good, he would seriously prejudice it. But our opponents maintain that God has commanded him not to aim at it; and we see therefore the issue of their theory. It comes to this: that God has commissioned him to wield an irresistible physical power over his countrymen; and has strictly commanded him to use that power in opposition to the reign of God Himself within their souls. No one who believes in God at all, will venture to accept such a conclusion as this.

Here, however, a few words must be interposed to prevent our being misunderstood. There is no reason whatever, we have said, for expecting that he who aims exclusively at temporal good will ordinarily effect spiritual. But the converse by no means follows; and it may well be thought, that by aiming at

spiritual good the ruler will more effectually secure temporal than in any other possible way : according to that Scripture, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added to you." This indeed is Gregory XVI.'s judgment, in that passage from his Encyclical on which we have rested throughout.

5. Our last argument shall be built on the consent of all who are in any sense religiously earnest, Catholic or non-Catholic. Can a single case be found where the theory which we oppose has been practically adopted by any civil ruler who was himself deeply impressed with the immeasurable pre-eminence of spirituals over temporals? Can any case be found, *e. g.*, where a zealous Catholic, being a member of Parliament, will refuse to promote a grant for Catholic education, however convinced he may be that the Church's interests will be thereby advanced, until he have first satisfied himself that such a measure will promote the temporal welfare of Great Britain and Ireland? Is anything like this even practically imaginable? Consider again the labours of several Catholic members, for which the whole Catholic body is so grateful, in behalf of our poor in workhouses and prisons. Such labours were, of course, directed expressly to the spiritual good of that oppressed class. Who is there to maintain that these members *ipso facto* transgressed the bounds prescribed by God to their political action? The theory which we are opposing, then, is a mere theory, which no ruler really interested in the advancement of spirituals could dream of carrying into action.

Having now argued both negatively and positively in behalf of our conclusion, it is time to consider the objections which have been, or imaginably may be, adduced in opposition; and it will be found that their consideration throws increased light on our meaning and adds increased strength to our reasoning.

1. The first objection comes from Catholics, and may be stated thus: God has founded the Church for the express purpose of promoting man's spiritual welfare: the State, therefore, can have no such end. The reply to this is most obvious, if we will take the analogy suggested by Gregory XVI.—that of parents.\* It might be quite as reasonably argued: The priest is entrusted by God with the child's spiritual training, and the parent therefore has no such office. Yet how indignant should we be at any such allegation, and how ready with our reply! We should argue, triumphantly, that the priest's office not only has not superseded the parent's spiritual duty,

---

\* *Positi quasi parentes et tutores populorum.*—*Encyclical.*  
VOL. I.—NO. I. [*New Series.*]

but that it has not even lessened it; what it has done is to fix that duty in one definite and cognizable direction. A parent, as such, is entrusted with the promotion of her child's highest good: the Catholic parent knows precisely what is the nature of that good, and what the appointed means of its attainment. The Catholic parent, we say, fulfils her duty to her child's soul, by bringing him into close relation with the priests of God, and educating him in a strict subordination to the Church's authority and guidance. And it is on the same principles—however great the difference of application—that a Catholic prince will confer spiritual benefits on those subject to his civil jurisdiction.

2. To the preceding analogy, however, it may be replied, and we may count this as a second objection, that the parent is concerned with those whose reason is immature, and that no authority can rightly be entrusted with the spiritual training of *adults*, unless it be specially endowed with that Divine Light which will enable it clearly to discover its way. We reply as follows:—We have already admitted, on this very ground, that the civil government has no right of directly moral and religious legislation. The parent has the right of such legislation over children, but the State has no such right over adult citizens. What we contend for is that the *civil governor* should promote his country's spiritual good by his *political measures*, through methods of the very same kind as those through which an individual would promote it in his *personal action*. And this being understood, it is plain that the present objection does not even touch the case of a Catholic ruler, for the counsels and guidance of the Church are as accessible to him in his political as in his personal capacity. But even as to a non-Catholic ruler the objection cannot gravely be maintained, unless it be also asserted that no non-Catholic, even as an individual, should aim directly at his neighbour's moral welfare. We have no wish at all to overrate the moral discernment of non-Catholics; but surely any one of them is far more likely to promote moral good by constantly labouring for that end, than by being wholly indifferent on the subject. We may add, also, that by this course he will ever be improving his own moral perception.

There is but one difficulty in the matter which is even plausible—the case, namely, of a non-Catholic government using its influence in opposition to the true faith. We have already referred to this difficulty, and engaged to treat it in a subsequent article. It cannot be handled satisfactorily—no one will think so,—unless it be considered in some detail, and therefore at some length.



3. A third objection has been made, also from a Catholic quarter: The State was anterior to the Catholic Church, and cannot, therefore, owe her deference and allegiance. In a Catholic's mouth, surely this statement is somewhat strange. Was not morality anterior to the Christian Church? And are we, on that account, at liberty to deny that the Church's exposition of morality demands our interior assent? But, indeed, the objection is so obviously fallacious, that a very few words will suffice in reply. In every age, indeed in every state of society, in virtue of the natural law itself, a civil governor acts more laudably in proportion as he more efficaciously directs his temporal administration to the people's highest good. But the establishment of the Catholic Church has enabled him to know certainly wherein that good exists; and has also taught him that he cannot satisfactorily promote it except by acting, and by inducing his subjects to act, in subordination to her Divine authority.

4. Another objection is suggested by Lord Macaulay's criticism on Mr. Gladstone. "Look at banks, insurance-offices, dock companies, canal companies, gas companies, hospitals, dispensaries. Can we gravely say," Lord Macaulay seems to ask, "that the managers of these various associations act more laudably in proportion as they aim at the spiritual good of their various members? Or would not such an attempt be rather a simple impertinence and injustice?" In answering this, for clearness' sake we will take one particular instance, that of a hospital; and what we say in this case may easily be extended over the whole catalogue. To bring out sharply the point at issue, we will suppose that this hospital is supported indiscriminately by persons of every religious denomination; and that by some strange accident a number of zealous Catholics form a majority of the governing body. The objection is, that if a Catholic ruler may devote public money to the promotion of his country's spiritual welfare, on the same principle these Catholics may similarly apply the corporate money with which they are entrusted. The reply is most obvious. They have been entrusted with this money for one purpose, and it is simple robbery if they apply it to any other. The parallel breaks down in the very particular which alone is relevant. The governing body of a hospital derives its authority from the subscribers; but the governing body of a nation derives its authority from God: taxpayers, as such, being under it, not over it. In a constitutional government like ours, many taxpayers, no doubt, have votes in electing members of parliament; but so far as regards this most limited function, they form a part of the government itself. Once

admit that the civil governor is a mere delegate, hired and employed by the taxpayers, there is no dearth, certainly, of frightful consequences which would follow from so detestable a premiss; but it is a premiss which every good Catholic abhors. We must recur to this under the next head of objection, and we will here therefore say no more.

The Catholic governors of such a hospital, therefore, cannot without robbery employ any of the corporate money to the promotion of Catholicism; neither can they without breach of trust employ their authority in that direction. But so far as is consistent with observing these strict obligations, they should consult the spiritual good both of subscribers and of patients. Thus, it is often very possible, without at all diminishing the hospital's efficiency in its proper work, to allow far greater time and facility for visits from the various religious ministers; and this the Catholic managers may most laudably effect. Or there may be this or that hospital arrangement more or less adverse to morality, and this they may be even bound to alter. In one word, they will act laudably by performing (in their official capacity) every service towards the spiritual good of those with whom they are brought into relation, except so far as they are debarred from such service by the conditions which those who delegated their office have expressly or interpretatively affixed to its exercise.

Another point of difference between the two cases should not be omitted. The civil governor, as we have seen, cannot be spiritually neutral; but the associations enumerated by Lord Macaulay are so altogether, as a general rule. Suppose the case to be otherwise; suppose, *e. g.*, that in some hospital priests were refused reasonable access to Catholic patients. In that case, if no redress could be obtained, Catholics might be bound, not only to retire from the management, but to withdraw their subscriptions.

5. Let us next consider the objection which we incidentally touched upon in discussing the last. It may be objected that the governor of a State is a delegate of the citizens, just as the governor of a hospital is a delegate of the subscribers; that the citizens employ or hire him for temporal, not spiritual work; and consequently that it is breach of trust if he uses his political influence, and actual robbery if he devotes public money, for any except a temporal purpose.

We reply, in the first place, that this doctrine (the sovereignty of the people) is simply revolutionary and anti-Catholic. We maintain it to be a most certain and sacred truth, that God has immediately instituted civil government, with all its intrinsic rights and functions, whatever they may

be;\* and that He has commanded all individual citizens to obey such government, as invested with His own authority. The best Catholic, no doubt, may utterly repudiate the divine right of kings as such, whether Stuarts or Bourbons. The best Catholic may hold that God gives no preference to one form of government over another, and that He has not (by His own immediate act) placed the reins of government in the hands of one rather than of another; nay, that in certain exceptional cases the collective people may legitimately nominate to the vacant sovereignty. But in holding such opinions, he will, no less cordially than other Catholics, abhor that revolutionary maxim above recited, which gives rise to the present objection.† The question, however, is too vital, especially under present circumstances, to be treated episodically; and we hope in an early number to argue at length against the revolutionary theory, on grounds of reason no less than authority.

But, secondly, we could never understand how this monstrous theory, even were it true, would affect our present argument. As to the great majority of European countries, if the citizens now living ever did delegate to their present rulers a power of government, this act of delegacy took place *in nubibus*, and its records are deposited in the same inaccessible region. Consequently, in regard to what was then delegated, I have as much right to my opinion as you have to yours. You say that the citizens entrusted the civil ruler only with the care of their temporal interests. I have just as much right to say that they also entrusted him with the care of their moral and spiritual advancement. Or rather, I have more to say for my opinion than you for yours; because no government can be spiritually neutral, and we must not pay them the bad compliment of supposing that they deliberately desired a sacrifice of their higher good to their lower.‡

\* *Suprema potestas civilis, per se spectata, immediate data est a Deo.*—*Suarez, "Defensio Fidei Catholice,"* l. 3, c. 2.

Observandum est, "politicam potestatem in universum consideratam . . . immediate esse a solo Deo."—*Bellarmino.*

† The contrast between the revolutionary doctrine of popular sovereignty, and any doctrine which has been advocated by Catholic theologians, is very clearly and forcibly, though briefly, stated in one of our earlier numbers. See *DUBLIN REVIEW*, vol. xxviii. p. 293, note.

We have nowhere seen the whole question (to our mind) so satisfactorily treated as in Mgr. Parisi's work, "*La Démocratie devant l'Enseignement Catholique.*" We may also warmly recommend Dr. Murray's essay in the fourth volume of the "*Annual Miscellany.*"

‡ Chaque individu veut que la société protège spécialement ce qu'il a de plus cher et de plus précieux. Mais est-il rien de plus précieux pour

Then, thirdly, let us even assume, for argument's sake, that men have everywhere personally and freely hired their respective rulers; and have delegated to them no other power than the preservation of exterior peace: we maintain that such delegacy would have been *ipso facto* null and void, and incapable therefore of standing as a foundation for duties. If the ruler do not directly consult his people's spiritual interests, he will certainly injure them. Now, no men have a right to entrust another with a power which will necessarily be injurious to their own highest good.\*

6. The remaining objection we have purposely reserved to the last, that by answering it we may finally complete our abstract theoretical statement. It may be said, then, that the common sense of mankind regards temporal good as the State's proper end; nay, and that we ourselves have admitted as much in the earlier part of our article.

In that part of our article we were speaking of the immediate end for which God instituted civil government; and we will here repeat in substance what we there affirmed. God, in originally instituting civil government, contemplated (if we may so express ourselves) as His immediate end the preservation of exterior peace; and as His ultimate end, the various benefits, both spiritual and temporal, which flow from such peace. To this statement we most entirely adhere; we only say that it does not exhaust the subject. Exterior peace cannot be secured unless the ruler have at his disposal irresistible physical force; and this circumstance brings him into various intimate relations with his people, from which flow *incidentally*, by the very natural law, certain obligations and counsels in regard both to their spiritual and temporal welfare. These obligations and counsels (we say) are from God himself; and yet they are not included in the primary end (whether immediate or ultimate) for which He instituted civil government. Such seems to us the true mode of harmonizing various propositions which at first seem inconsistent; and we will proceed, therefore, to draw two somewhat important inferences from this fundamental principle.

---

*l'individu et pour une nation que la religion elle-meme ? . . . Que de fois ne voit-on pas des peuples défendre leur religion avec plus de persistance et de dévouement que leur propre indépendance politique ? . . . Quand on veut exprimer en deux mots le caractère d'une lutte suprême, on dit qu'il combat "pro aris et focis,"—l'autel avant le foyer.—M. l'Abbé Godard, "Les Principes de '89," p. 16.*

\* The community has no power to confer [a right] unless so far as it harmonizes with the law of God and their own spiritual and temporal well-being.—*Murray On Education*, p. 310.

Firstly, the preservation of exterior peace is the ruler's one primary function. It is of strict obligation. Nay, if he signally fails to preserve exterior peace, he forfeits his claim to the very title of civil governor.

Secondly, since God's immediate end in the institution is a certain temporal good, we cannot be surprised to find that the State has far greater intrinsic aptitude for the promotion of man's temporal than his spiritual welfare. Thus a country's advancement in material wealth is no more included in the primary function of civil government, than is her advancement in piety and love of God ; and yet the ruler, so far as he acts by his own light and with his own proper instruments, has indefinitely more power towards the lower end than towards the higher. A good Catholic who has any share in civil government feels this most keenly. On questions, *e.g.*, of free trade or currency, he proceeds in the last resort on his own discretion and responsibility ; but where moral and spiritual good is concerned, he feels deeply that his only true attitude is that of subordination to the Church's guidance and authority.

And if we suppose the case of a ruler inculpably non-Catholic, the truth of our statement will but emerge more clearly. Such a ruler, if pious and conscientious, would unquestionably direct his political measures in great degree to the people's spiritual good ; and yet, in the very fact of doing so, he would receive the strongest practical impression that he is, as we may say, out of his depth. He finds that the knowledge to which he has access, and the resources which he has at command, are fully adequate to the promotion of temporal good in some important branches. But he would be reminded, at every turn, that in working for moral and spiritual good, or for those kinds of temporal good which are inseparably bound up therewith, he is attempting a task above his powers. We are far from meaning that he should not make the attempt, and we are far from denying that real and important benefits would result from his making it ; but we maintain confidently that the more steadily he should apply himself to that end, so much the more keenly would he feel his urgent need of support from some authority higher, more spiritual, more specially Divine, than his own. It is impossible here to explain our meaning with any fulness ; but in a future article the whole subject will recur.

We see, then, that there is more than one sense in which temporal good, as distinct from spiritual, is the civil governor's proper work. The immediate end for which God instituted his office is temporal ; his one primary function, and the only one whose positive fulfilment is of strict obliga-

tion, is temporal;\* and so long as he is restricted to his own proper intelligence and his own proper instruments, he cannot work with due and satisfactory effectiveness for an end higher than temporal.

And yet, on the whole, the office of civil governor, in its own nature and idea, is venerable and sacred; and we regard it as among the calamities of our time that there are so many countries in which this doctrine is but little acknowledged, whether by governors or governed. Its primary function—the preservation of exterior peace—is in itself no doubt temporal; yet that very temporal function is of vital importance to the spiritual order, and he who faithfully fulfils it confers an invaluable benefit on souls. The administration of justice, again, and the infliction of capital punishment,—these are no *incidents* of civil government: they are indispensable means to the immediate end of its institution; and how prominently do they exhibit the secular authority as a visible representative to the nation of God's Eternal Justice! Lastly, any civil governor, without travelling at all beyond his proper sphere, has considerable opportunities of advancing moral and spiritual good, and fulfils his office better in proportion as he takes more advantage thereof; while, in the case of a Catholic ruler, acting with deference and subordination to the Church, such opportunities are of value almost incalculable. And if it be thought that the miserable secularity of aim which has ever disgraced the great majority of governments makes such declarations inadvisable, we assert the very contrary. That a ruler shall recognize the intrinsic sacredness of his office, is the first step towards his fulfilling it in a less unworthy spirit. Nor can it be too often remembered that the emperor was heathen, and among the worst even of his class, when the apostles spoke so strongly on the divine character and authority of the "*potestates sublimiores*." Every one must be struck with the spirit of reverence towards civil government which such passages breathe.

It only remains, so far as our present article is concerned, to speak of the ecclesiastical testimony to our doctrine. And so far as the question relates to the religious functions of a Catholic ruler in dealing with his Catholic subjects, a very few words will suffice. The declaration, indeed, of Gregory XVI., on

---

\*If the ruler is sluggish in pursuing spiritual good, or temporal good other than protection of person and property, he acts less laudably; but he does not necessarily violate a strict obligation. His *obligations* in regard to spiritual good are very far more negative than positive.



which we have rested throughout, is so clear and unequivocal that nothing can possibly be more so. He tells Catholic princes that their authority is given to them even more for the protection of the Church than for the governance of the world; that the cause of faith should be dearer to them than that of their own rule; and that their chief care should be the security of religion. Every sentence tells against those who hold that the temporal ruler, when a Catholic, transgresses his province if he directly aim at supernatural good in his temporal administration.

We had intended here to multiply authorities by citing (1) the office for a king's coronation; (2) the universal approbation given by the Church to the pious zeal of Catholic emperors; and (3) the statements of individual theologians. But as there cannot by possibility be a difference of opinion on the matter, and as our article has already run to too great a length, we will forbear. It is more necessary to consider a question on which there is some apparent room for divergency of opinion, and which is not without considerable practical importance. It is absolutely certain, on grounds of authority, that a Catholic prince acts legitimately and laudably in promoting the spiritual good of his Catholic people. But two different theories are imaginable, as foundations for this admitted conclusion. It may be thought, on the one hand, that such a function is inherent in his office; or, on the other hand, that it is exercised by him only in virtue of some delegation from the Church. For ourselves, we do not indeed at all deny the Church's power to delegate such authority, were such delegation necessary, for, as we have already said, we avoid in this article the whole question. But we maintain that such delegation is *not* necessary; for that the function of promoting his people's spiritual good appertains to a Catholic prince in virtue of his office. Now, in taking this alternative, we are met by an apparent difficulty. Civil government existed long before the Catholic Church; and civil authority is still exercised by many who have never heard of that Church. If the function, then, of promoting spiritual good be inherent in the office of a Catholic prince, it must be in virtue of some more general principle, which includes this as a particular case. Nor can any such general principle be imagined except that which we have throughout advocated—viz., that the civil ruler (Catholic or non-Catholic) acts more laudably in proportion as he more energetically pursues his people's highest good, so far as he is cognisant of such good. This being premised, it will be seen that the issue resolves itself into this. Those whom we follow, hold that the Catholic prince's function of promoting spiritual good is entrusted to

him immediately by God. Our opponents, on the contrary, maintain that this function accrues to him in no other way than by delegation from the Church; and that apart from such delegation it would not appertain to him at all. As far as argument goes, we have reasoned throughout in favour of our own alternative; the present question is, on which side stands Catholic authority.

Gregory XVI.'s words in themselves are absolutely decisive. That pontiff, adopting the expression of his predecessor S. Leo the Great, declares that the authority of Catholic princes has been conferred on them, not only for the governance of the world, but chiefly for the protection of the Church. He speaks then of some Giver as having conferred on them this power for two ends; the higher end being the chief one. He cannot possibly be speaking of the Church as that giver; for no one maintains that it is the Church which delegates to a king his authority "for the government of the world." It follows, therefore, that, in Gregory XVI.'s judgment, God himself conferred on princes the function of protecting the Church. And the Pope continues in a similar strain. He exhorts princes to make the security of religion their chief end, on the ground of their "position" as "parents and tutors of their [respective] peoples." But this "position" is assigned to them by God himself, not by the Church; and it follows, therefore, that God himself has given them the office of labouring for the security of religion.

Those whom we have called throughout our "theological opponents" have one theological ground, and (we think) only one, for their view; but that ground, we most fully admit, is at first glance an extremely strong one. They rest on the very definite and explicit statement, made repeatedly by Suarez and other theologians, that the end of civil government is not moral and spiritual good, but exclusively temporal. If we are able to show, however, that these theologians do not really deny any part of the doctrine which we have advocated, the whole question of authority must be decided in our favour. And we consider that we *are* able to show this satisfactorily and irrefragably.

But before approaching Suarez, let us say a few words on S. Thomas. His work "*De Regimine Principum*" is a political, not a theological, treatise; which makes it the more remarkable how consistently and undeviatingly he assigns to the civil government, as its chief function, the promotion of God's service and worship. Thus, in the passage already cited (note to p. 79), he says, "*It pertains to the office of king to effect that the life of the multitude shall be good, in accordance*

with what is suitable for the attainment of heavenly beatitude" (l. i., c. 15). And elsewhere even more expressly he speaks of "divine worship, towards which kings and princes should aim with their whole endeavour and anxiety, as towards their due end." (l. ii., c. 16. See the original quoted in note to p. 78). Nay, as if to show still more clearly that he is not speaking of any power delegated by the Church, he extends his remarks to "every monarchy [which has existed] from the beginning of the world."\* From this, one conclusion at all events follows. Even though it had been true that Suarez and other theologians teach differently, we should have had to choose between their authority on one side and S. Thomas's on the other.

Suarez's teaching, however, does not, in fact, at all diverge from S. Thomas's. He frequently says, indeed (we fully admit it), that the civil power does not regard spiritual good here, nor eternal felicity hereafter, as its proper end, whether proximate or ultimate;† but only the temporal good of the community. Nor can we at all wonder that such a mode of speech should be regarded by our opponents as decisive in their sense. Their obvious argument may be this: If the end of civil government be exclusively temporal good, the ruler (unless he receive some delegated power from the Church) transgresses his prescribed province, and in fact violates a strict obligation, if in his political measures he directly pursues a spiritual and supernatural end. We are quite confident, however, that Suarez's doctrine is totally different from this. And we will give our opponents their greatest possible advantage by confining our argument to that very chapter in which Suarez states, more emphatically than anywhere else, the proposition on which they rely. We refer to the eleventh chapter of his third book, "De Legibus." We will first show that it cannot possibly bear the sense which they affix to it; and, secondly, we will explain what we believe him to have really meant. They, on their side, will of course concede to us the indubitable fact, that throughout this chapter he is speaking of functions intrinsically appertaining to the civil governor, and that he is not supposing any delegation from the Church.

First, then, if we will but believe Suarez's express words in this very chapter, it is absolutely certain that he raises no objection (but very much the contrary) against the civil governor

---

\* In quâlibet monarchiâ ab initio sæculi tria se invicem per ordinem comitata sunt: divinus cultus, sapientia scholastica, et secularis potentia.

† For instance: "Potestas civilis et jus civile per se non respiciunt æternam felicitatem supernaturalem vitæ futuræ tanquam finem proprium vel proximum vel ultimum."—*De Legibus*, l. iii., c. 11, n. 4.

pursuing a supernatural end in his policy and legislation. He says expressly that "Catholic legislators, in enacting their laws, *may, and in part ought, to regard the supernatural end.*"\* He further lays it down, that a Catholic prince is actually under the obligation "of commanding nothing through this [civil] power which is contrary to the supernatural end, or *may impede its attainment.*"† But if this be so, a Catholic prince, *as prince*, is bound to consider his people's supernatural good with no small degree of "circumspection" and attention. Suarez, however, goes further than this. He quotes, with complete approbation, S. Augustine's words concerning Catholic emperors: "We account them happy if they make their power a servant to His Majesty, *for the purpose of spreading as widely as possible the worship of God.*" He cites, with no less approval, S. Leo's praise of Theodosius, because the latter "showed not only a royal but also a sacerdotal mind; and because he laboured to avert heresies and schisms." He merely adds the caution, that this *positive* promotion of supernatural interests by the civil government is ordinarily a matter, not of precept, but of counsel.‡ Nothing can bring into stronger light the contrast between Suarez's doctrine and that of our opponents. Let us suppose the case of a Catholic prince who adopts some political measure, avowedly and exclusively, for the sake of a supernatural end; who devotes public money, *e.g.*, to the support of certain priests, simply for the sake of the good thence accruing to souls. And let us further suppose that there is no question at all of any delegation of authority from the Church. What shall we say of his act? "He is

---

\* Licet ipsi legislatores fideles in suis legibus ferendis, intueri possint, et ex parte debeant, supernaturalem finem.—*De Legibus*, l. iii., c. 11, n. 9.

† Per circumspectionem nihil statuendi per hanc potestatem, quod sit contrarium fini supernaturali vel ejus consecutionem impedire possit. Quæ observantia . . . est non tantum in consilio sed etiam in præcepto maxime proprio Christiani ac Catholici principis.—n. 11.

‡ "Hanc finem [temporalem] semper intendit ipsa [civilis] potestas quatenus talis est; licet utens illa possit *perfectius* operari. Et hoc modo Leo papa laudat Theodosium, quod . . . non solum regium animum sed etiam sacerdotalem ostenderet, et quod curam haberet avertendi hereses et schismata" (n. 10). "Legislatio civilis . . . actio honesta est . . . ergo est de se *apta* referri ad finem supernaturalem. Ergo princeps Christianus facile potest in eam finem illam dirigere, et optime faciet illam referendo, juxta illud Augustini, ubi de regibus Christianis sit: 'Felices eos dicimus, si suam potestatem ad Dei cultum maxime dilatandum majestati Ejus famulam faciunt' . . . Est autem observandum, hanc relationem posse dupliciter fieri; primo *per positivam ordinationem*; et sic regulariter erit in consilio, nisi ubi speciale præceptum, vel necessitas ad illam obligaverit . . . Secundo intelligi potest per negationem tantum, seu per circumspectionem nihil statuendi," etc., as just now quoted.—n. 11.

violating an obligation," say our opponents; "he is fulfilling a counsel," says Suarez.

What then *is* Suarez's meaning, here and in other places, when he insists so much on the end of civil government as being merely temporal good? We reply, he is speaking throughout of the class of acts which the civil ruler has authority to command, and the class of offences which he has authority to punish.\* The analysis of his argument is this: "The end for which God instituted civil government is temporal good; † the ruler therefore has been entrusted with no other kind of authority except such as is requisite for that end. He may command his subjects to pay taxes, or to serve in the army; he may not command them (on his own authority) to frequent the sacraments and be regular at mass. He may punish them for robbery or murder; he may not punish them (unless the Church delegates to him spiritual jurisdiction) for eating meat on abstinence days, or for heresy. Such, then, and such only, is the authority with which God has entrusted him: it is temporal, and not spiritual. Nevertheless, he is under the obligation of not so exercising this temporal authority as to impede his people in attaining their supernatural end. Still further, he acts more perfectly and more according to counsel, in proportion as he more defers to the maxims of S. Augustine and S. Leo; in proportion as he more closely imitates the great Theodosius; in proportion (that is) as he more energetically devotes his temporal authority to the advancement of spirituals." This is a most definite and intelligible theory; and if we accept it as the clue to Suarez's meaning, we shall find that the whole chapter hangs together most naturally and consistently. For ourselves, we are not prepared to maintain that his reasoning is throughout satisfactory; but the conclusions at which he arrives, the whole doctrine which he lays down on the relation of civil government to spiritual good, is, in all essential particulars, identical with that advocated in the preceding pages.

And whenever scholastic theologians dwell on the proposition

\* "*Dico, potestatem hanc civilem non extendi in materiâ vel actibus suis ad finem supernaturalem,*" are his words.

† There are two points on which we have ventured to differ from Suarez here. Firstly, we consider that the immediate end for which civil government was instituted, is not temporal good in general, but one particular part of it—viz., the protection of person and property. Secondly, we consider that the ultimate end contemplated by God in the primary institution, is not temporal good only, but, much more, moral and spiritual—viz., all the moral and spiritual good which flows from security of person and property.

that civil government was instituted for a temporal end, they do so invariably (as we confidently maintain) in reference to the class of acts which the prince has authority to command and to punish. Nothing can be more alien from their whole structure of thought, from their express assertions and their undeviating implications, than the notion that a Catholic prince transgresses his intrinsic province by directing temporal authority to spiritual good.

It so happens that a recent publication furnishes us with an excellent indication of the Church's mind on this whole matter. An excellent French priest, M. Godard, put out a little volume two years ago on the *Principles of '89*. It was promptly placed on the Index, and as promptly revoked by the author. He at once proceeded to Rome, and put himself into communication with the most accredited theologians; and the result has been a second edition of his work, guaranteed by them as in no respect open to theological censure. We may be pretty sure, then, that if there be any important statement contained in the first edition, but omitted and contradicted in the second, such statement was accounted censurable by the Roman authorities. Now, in the condemned edition, M. Godard referred to the opinion, as tolerated among Catholics, that the sovereign's authority should not be directed to a spiritual end, but exclusively to a temporal one. In the approved edition, however, he speaks most differently, and implies that those who hold such an opinion are censurable. For himself he adds these remarkable words: "Although spiritual good in this life and eternal felicity in the next are not the immediate end of civil society, yet it ought to be *organized and directed as far as possible* in such a manner as to *guide the individual towards his true end*, to which all the rest should be subordinated. . . . The individual claims at the hands of society aid and protection to arrive at the absolute good, the supreme end of his existence."\*

Here then for the present we close our argument, having completed indeed our abstract theoretical statement. In an early number (though not in the very next) we hope to

---

\* Quoique le bien spirituel ici bas et la félicité de l'autre vie ne soient pas le but immédiat de la société civile, elle doit être néanmoins organisée et dirigée autant que possible de manière à conduire l'individu vers la fin dernière, à laquelle il faut subordonner tout le reste. . . . L'individu . . . réclame de la société aide et protection, pour arriver au bien absolu, but suprême de son existence.—*Principes de '89*, p. 152.

The excellent author of this work died, very soon after its appearance, at an early age, and to the deep regret of all who knew him.



resume the subject ; for we have yet to treat the practical application of our theory. We have still to consider what relations, in fact, would exist between the ecclesiastical and civil governments, whenever both should duly perform their proper functions. We have further to meet the obvious objection that our theory would go far to justify Protestant governments in adopting a policy of injustice and persecution towards the Catholic Church. Lastly, we must apply our general theory to the special circumstances of the present time, and in particular to the case of a Catholic having part in the Legislature of these islands. We heartily regret that we have no room here to enter on these momentous discussions ; for we are well aware that there is at last no method of testing theoretical truth which is so good and satisfactory as that of considering in detail its practical application.

A few further remarks on the subject treated in this article, will be found in the first of our "Notices of Books."

#### ART. IV.—ROSA FERRUCCI.

*Rosa Ferrucci : ses Lettres et sa Mort.* Par l'Abbé Henri Perreye. Paris : Douiniol, 1858.

IT has been matter of surprise to us that so remarkable a work as the "Life and Letters of Rosa Ferrucci," although published both in Italian\* and French, has remained so little known amongst us. In these days, when men are anxious both to range great Italian names on the side of rebellion and schism, and to prove that the Italy of the past was unable to foster education and genius, it is well to draw attention to a collection of writings which so abundantly refutes the assertion.

Rosa Ferrucci was a very gifted being ; she possessed natural talents of the highest order, and she had also the advantage of wise parents, who knew how to direct and cultivate the remarkable powers of her mind. Her father was a professor in the University of Pisa, and her mother an authoress of some celebrity. Rosa was taught well and learnt well. At six years old she could read Italian, French, and German.

\* *Rosa Ferrucci, e alcuni suoi Scritti, pubblicati per cura di sua madre.* Florence : 1857. A second edition, which appeared in 1858, has been enriched with additional matter at the express desire of Mgr. Charvaz, Archbishop of Genoa.

At a more advanced age she knew the whole "*Divina Commedia*" of Dante by heart. She was also an excellent Latin scholar,—studying, however, under her mother's careful eye,—and was well read in the standard authors, as well of her own country as of England, France, and Germany. She kept up a correspondence in three languages—French, German, and Italian—in the latter, chiefly with her betrothed. Each collection of letters is remarkable; but the object of her biographer having been to give a portrait of the sweetness, purity, and holiness of this young girl—a portrait unconsciously furnished by herself—rather than to display her mental gifts, it is these alone of which his translation enables us to judge. To her solid acquirements she added great proficiency in music, for which she was distinguished even in that land of music. At seventeen she was, in short, a highly educated and accomplished woman.

But Rosa Ferrucci, with all her abilities and all her learning, was very far removed in character as well from those "strong-minded," self-reliant women who, valuing themselves on their mental superiority and rare acquirements, imagine they have a mission to reform society, as from that more numerous class who delight in a vain display of their brilliant but frivolous accomplishments. Her French biographer, the Abbé Perreyve, who was personally acquainted with her family and with herself, observes that her education would almost have entitled a man to rank among the learned. Her rare mental gifts, however, being beside the object he has in view, a recurrence to them would interrupt his more important and edifying theme. He contents himself, therefore, with observing, once for all, that having spent several months in close intercourse with her excellent family, he can bear witness to the child-like modesty of this extraordinary girl; a modesty which she not only never outstepped, but which taught her to be ingenious in the art of self-concealment. "I leave, then, on one side," he adds, "all that relates to this intellectual culture and taste for classical learning, which took so pure and exalted a form in this young Christian maiden. Understood and accepted in Italy, such literary habits would be reckoned strange in France, where there exists an extravagant fear of anything which tends to raise a woman's mind above a certain intellectual level. I prefer, therefore, after this necessary allusion to them, to limit my notice to the saintly virtues of this young girl."

Undoubtedly, her literary eminence is of very secondary moment. It is as an example of the all-absorbing love of God and of perfection in a young soul, while as yet the prospects of earth had all the freshness of spring and the promise of

summer, that Rosa Ferrucci comes before us. To dwell much upon her mental endowments in presence of the spiritual beauty of her soul would indeed be a mistake. The two excellences are of course not comparable; and to talk long of Rosa Ferrucci the accomplished scholar, is to forget, or to cast into the shade, Rosa Ferrucci the exalted Christian. Yet we conceive that there is one great advantage in keeping in view the combination of the two characters; and it may be well to pause awhile to consider the unusual phenomenon she exhibited: a young girl, possessing talents and acquirements which would almost have entitled her to a professor's chair, yet distinguished by a retiring modesty and a sweet simplicity which might have characterized some young novice brought up in the cloister's shade, who had never studied in any other school but that of Christ, or knew of any other praise but the praise of doing well in the sight of God.

It will be said, perhaps, that we have the key to the mystery in the Abbé Perreyve's observation. Whatever may have been, or may now be, the ordinary standard of female education in Italy, learned and accomplished ladies (he says) have been common at all times in that country, and are still no rarity. Women of genius there meet with an impartial and generous encouragement; they are neither absurdly applauded, nor jealously and suspiciously watched; and when they enter upon the studies usually reserved to men, it is neither matter for admiration nor the occasion of a sneer. The outward hyperbolic compliment does not ill veil the inward ill-natured censure; things are on their natural footing. Hence, talented and learned women are not beset with temptations to non-naturalness, affectation, or vanity. We think this reply hardly satisfactory. For, after all, eminence *is* eminence everywhere; and mental acquirements will, *cæteris paribus*, always be more highly commended proportionably in a woman than in a man, because they have been attained with fewer advantages.

Again, it may be said, Rosa Ferrucci was a good Catholic; her religious education had been strictly attended to; her piety was the guardian of her modesty and humility. This is perfectly true; it is the true answer inclusively; but it is not sufficiently explicit. Every one knows that religious principles and devout habits must tend to foster humility and counteract vanity. It is even obvious that good sense, coupled with a sound moral and careful religious education, such as it would be most unfair to deny is imparted, according to their lights, in many Protestant families, has a considerable effect in checking conceit and an overweening self-value, whatever may be its success in eradicating occult pride. If much,

however, can be secured in the way of safeguard against the snares of literary eminence external to the Church, how much more may we not expect within her pale, and under all her sanctifying influences. But this is not precisely the question—which is, not how temptation is overcome, but how it is counteracted and comparatively removed. How are the peculiar temptations incident to female mental and literary superiority deprived of their force by Catholic training?

We believe the answer is to be sought in the prominence given in a genuine Catholic education to its proper objects. The duties of our state in life being our main duties, whatever fits us for their performance is our most valuable and best knowledge. Accordingly, where there is a due conception and estimation of that which constitutes the proper sphere of a Christian woman, there will be a corresponding appreciation of all which trains her to fulfil its requirements; and the child will be brought up with an habitual respect and esteem for that upon which its parents evidently set the greatest practical value. Now, the glory and dignity of woman is to be sought in the performance of her domestic duties. In the family she is the presiding genius, the informing spirit. If the master of the house possesses the executive and repressive power, to the woman belongs the administrative; while the education of at least half the human race, and the first moulding of the minds of the other half, at an age when impressions are most durable, is entirely in her hands. The influence of the mistress of a family is further increased by her relation to the servants forming the household over which she presides. Humble, therefore, as her sphere may be considered, it is, in many respects, as influential, in some more so, than that of man. But this is not our present concern. The true dignity of an occupation consists in this—that it is the fulfilment of our appointed calling.

We are not of the number of those who form an exaggerated estimate of the virtues of our forefathers: each age has its merits, and each has its faults. The middle ages have been, perhaps, almost as absurdly exalted as they were once unfairly depreciated. The fact is, that they have their good and their bad side; and a comparison with the present times must vary in its results, according as we regard the one or the other. We believe, however, that it would be quite true to say that the types of excellence which were before men's minds in those days were eminently Catholic. How grand is their ideal of the Christian hero! How pure, how sweetly austere, that of the Christian matron! How frequently does the description of excellent women in those times remind us of that of the "valiant

woman" in the Proverbs! The care of the household was then considered, not merely as the duty of a woman, but as her honourable duty, and its due fulfilment her glory.

As far as any system of education is truly Catholic, the same solid results will of course ensue in our day; and we believe that many a family in old Catholic countries is reared upon this genuine Christian type to an extent of which we English are scarcely aware. Protestantism surrounds us; and with Protestantism a fresh standard of excellence has been forming,\* which, while it admits certain moral and Christian elements, borrows largely from the world. The new ideas on the subject of education and of progress, which are so widely prevalent, have thrown the supernatural end of man far into the background: it is no longer even theoretically the one object to which all educational efforts are directed. With what force all this must react upon our social state, and upon our estimate of the perfection of the female character, must be self-evident; and its influence cannot but tell with injurious effect even upon the manners and habits of Catholic families.

We shall be told, however, that the home virtues of woman are still as highly valued as ever, and that no woman is really esteemed who does not acquit herself well of her domestic duties. This is true in a sense, but with a distinction that amounts to an essential difference. Granted that the woman who neglects the duties of her state is censured; and that ill brought-up children and an ill-ordered household are considered a matter of reproach to the mother and the mistress of a family; yet the fulfilment *in person* of these duties is no longer regarded as necessary; and the manner of their fulfilment is consequently very different from that which the Catholic standard requires. Money and position are at once considered to exonerate a woman from all such troubles; if she can pay for having these duties performed, she is reckoned to have performed them. An accomplished governess for her children, and a respectable and efficient housekeeper over her servants, are regarded as satisfactory substitutes; and no one dreams of accusing her of neglecting her home duties. Having thus freed herself from these vulgar

---

\* How long the traditional habits of the family, founded on the old Catholic type, lingered on in England, is known to those who are but slightly conversant with the annals and memorials of private life that have come down to us. We may, however, take this opportunity of calling attention to that most pleasing work, "The Home Life of English Ladies in the Seventeenth Century." (London: Bell & Daldy, 1860.) The subject is one of the deepest practical interest; and we intend to return to it on an early occasion.

cares, she is in a condition to fill to admiration the sphere for which her education has chiefly prepared her. She presides in the drawing-room; she embellishes home with her cheerful and graceful presence; she takes her place at the head of her table, and in society, to her own and her husband's satisfaction. She pays the tradesmen's bills once a week, or once a month, as the case may be; she makes such changes in her establishment, from time to time, as her housekeeper suggests; but the whole administration and influence are really in that servant's hand, and not in her own; and the same may be said as respects her children and their paid teachers. It is true that there are women who are personally more active, both in the education of their children and in the management of their household affairs; and there are a still larger number who, from the mere fact that they cannot afford either governess or housekeeper, are compelled to perform these offices for themselves, and who acquit themselves therein with more or less of cheerfulness and conscientiousness. But in the regret so often expressed at the little time which such employments leave for other avocations, a lurking feeling is betrayed that a personal discharge of a woman's domestic duties is something by the way—an inconvenience which is necessarily attached to straitened circumstances. Add to which, that few women have been trained to any experimental knowledge of household work: accordingly, when the necessities of their condition compel them to exercise some personal superintendence, their interference, prompted by economy and not guided by knowledge, assumes too often the appearance of a vexatious and intrusive intermeddling in the eyes of their servants; intercourse with whom, if conducted on true Christian principles, by one who was herself an adept in household matters, would exercise the most salutary influence. The dignity of the *materfamilias* is thus altogether lowered and the whole conception vulgarized. It is evident, therefore, that, when people speak of woman fulfilling her home duties, and possessing those feminine virtues which entitle her to commendation, it is not the Catholic type of excellence on which their estimation is founded. Consequently, it is not surprising that personally to excel in the performance of strictly domestic duties is no longer the ambition of women. They are necessary obligations, to neglect which would be disgraceful, but to perform well is not ennobling. Praise and admiration, which follow excellence as its shadow, have moved to another sphere.

Far otherwise is it in families such as that to which this young Italian girl belonged. How different must have been "the grave habits of that Christian household," where (as her



biographer tells us) every veil, every precaution, which the fears of modesty could suggest, was adopted to shield her from the admiration she excited in all who knew her! We can well conceive how a child in the bosom of such a family would learn to attach far more importance to the performance of her domestic duties than to learning and accomplishments.

The conclusion, then, to which we are led is, that the combination in Rosa Ferrucci of the sweetest humility and simplicity with great superiority in learning and talents, while it constitutes one of her great claims on our admiration, points also to an education widely different from that which, unhappily, is so common amongst ourselves. It points to the superior estimate in which all those employments are held which require for their discharge not learning, not talents, not accomplishments, but the possession of every humble Christian virtue. Rich in these, a woman is admirable in all that constitutes the dignity of her sex; if she be learned and talented besides, it is something supplementary and accidental, which may confer a grace, but could never stand in the place of, or excuse inferiority in, any womanly excellence, and which invests it with no real additional merit. Whatever is calculated to attract attention, to charm, to dazzle, to command the praise of the world, will, it is true, ever be a snare to humility and simplicity; it cannot be otherwise. But every one must clearly see with how many more obstacles Divine grace will have to contend, when the standard of excellence in the Christian family has been lowered and warped in condescension to that of the world—when the proficiency which is most warmly commended, from a girl's very first entrance into the schoolroom, is in those things which fit her for quite a different theatre from the scene of the triumphs of the Christian matron.

If Rosa Ferrucci possessed, as apparently she did, every advantage from her education in a family that kept the pure Christian pattern ever before it, the good seed fell on a very rich soil. We judge from the exuberance of the produce. This gracious child early exhibited the peculiar signs which have marked the beginning of those saints who have been saints from their infancy. With the religious discharge of her domestic duties she combined, not only, as we might expect, a tender charity for the poor of Christ, but what her biographer characterizes as a very passion for them. It seemed to have its source in a fountain so full, that it welled forth and overflowed towards every object that called for pity. Her whole soul seemed steeped in compassion. "From the little birds which, when scarcely more than an infant, she loved to

feed in winter-time, to the poor beggars of Pisa, whom she relieved by denying herself in dress and amusements, and the untended graves which she adorned with flowers, 'because,' she would say, 'I feel a pity for neglected graves'—all poverty had resistless claims upon her heart." Her mother relates several touching incidents of her charity. During a severe winter it was observed that she had left off eating bread at her meals, although she took care always to pick out the largest piece for herself. Her parents affected not to know what her object was. She answered, blushing, "I hope I have not done wrong; indeed I did not know it was wrong; but bread is so dear this year, and this piece would serve for one poor person." If she met, when out walking, a poor woman tottering under a heavy load of wood, her first impulse would be to run and help her; and it was difficult to restrain her loving eagerness. She would then gently complain, and declare she could never get accustomed to seeing poor people toiling so hard. One day she went to Florence to purchase some pieces of music. As she entered the town she met a poor family in a state of extreme distress. If their rent were not paid next day, they would be homeless. At once the money was given, and a farewell said to the much-desired pieces of music. When she returned home, and her friends, to hide their admiration, affected to chide her, she replied, "What would you have had me do? How could I have done other than I did? Now tell me, you know well it was *impossible*." "Oh, holy impossibilities!" exclaims her biographer, "which embarrass only those who can never be resigned to the sufferings of others."

For two years before her death Rosa was betrothed to a Signor Gaetano Orsini, a distinguished lawyer of Leghorn. We are not told the reasons for which their marriage was delayed so long, but probably it was on account of the extreme youth of the bride. A constant correspondence was kept up between them; and we believe that our readers will agree with us in thinking that the love-letters of Rosa Ferrucci were well worthy of being given to the world. Written with all simplicity by one who never dreamed that other eyes than those of her lover would peruse them, and expressing as they do the deep, pure love of the writer, they are at the same time a memorial of a most refined and cultivated intellect, and of a fervently religious heart. On this latter point her biographer says: "In the midst of her joys, her hopes, the festive preparations for her wedding and the dreams of future happiness, this young girl had her eye always fixed upon God. One idea, immense, insatiable, the idea of perfection, was the dominant

desire of her soul. She gazed through the veil of her joyous dawns on the Divine Sun of Eternal Beauty. Her happiness made earth look bright to her, but the very brightness of earth immediately made her mindful of heaven. She would begin to sing of her earthly love, but the song soon became a hymn, and always ended with God. It is this insensible and almost involuntary transition, of which the writer seems herself unconscious, from an earthly affection to ardent aspiration after Divine love and perfection, which constitutes the beauty of her letters. The reader must never forget that they were written by one who was little more than a child, and that what there was of maturity in her young soul was derived from that sun of Christian faith whose warm beams ripen the intellect while the heart retains the freshness of its childhood. I believe that real and valuable instruction may be found in these pages; and that while the beautiful language in which her thoughts are couched, reveals the life of duty she habitually led, we may discover many lessons of duty for ourselves. There is nothing of mere poetical dreaming here: all is practical—all is reality."

No extracts would convey a true idea of these remarkable letters,—their fragrance would be dissipated, and their beauty spoilt; we will therefore give some of them at length.

## ROSA TO GAETANO.

*Pisa, April 16th, 1856.*

I can never thank God enough for giving me in you, my Gaetano, an example and a guide for my whole life. I cannot refrain from often saying so to my mother; and I say it because it is deep in my heart. Spite of all the faults and imperfections which have so often prevented my remaining faithful to the good resolutions which I constantly make before God, I have such a high idea of the perfection of a Christian wife, and of the duties I shall soon have to fulfil, that I should really be terrified if I did not confide in the goodness of God, Who can do all, and Who will aid me who can do nothing. I often speak to my mother of the awe with which the sacrament we are going to receive inspires me; and I earnestly beg you, my Gaetano, to ask our Lord for the graces that are necessary to make me what I ought to be. I promise you to use every effort for this end; and I will dedicate the prayers of the month of May to this intention, for I have great confidence that the Blessed Virgin will obtain for me what I still lack. I am sure that a great progress towards perfection will be made if we can get sincerely to detest all those little daily faults, which seem trifles to us, but which must be so very displeasing to the Infinite Perfection of God. In all this be sure I will receive your counsels and admonitions as from him who, by the Will of God, stands to me in the place of father and mother.

*April 17th.*

I am persuaded that the true means of preparing ourselves to receive the sacrament by which we shall be united for time and eternity, is to make every effort to attain that state of Christian perfection to which God calls us ; and sure I am that, if we cannot arrive absolutely at that degree of perfection which we ardently desire, at least we can kindle in our hearts the flames of that divine love, which is itself the fulfilling of the whole law. In this you will be my guide and my example, Gaetano ; we two shall have but one will ; and we shall have but one love also, since we shall love each other in God, in Whom all affections become holy. Our affection did not spring from anything external, nor from passing beauty, that flower of a day. It was a stronger tie that bound our souls together. We love each other because we love God. Our oneness is in Him, because in Him is all the virtue, all the purity of our love ; because in Him also is our sovereign good. Hence, Gaetano, those alternations of joy and sadness, according as we approach, or seem to be receding from, the ideal type of perfection which is the object of our desires. Ah ! how good God is ; and how often I bless Him for having put such desires and such hopes into our hearts. For me, I behold in God not only the Eternal Power who created Heaven and earth, or the Eternal Love who redeemed us, but also that Tender Mercy who in thee has given me, as it were, His crowning blessing.

*April 25th.*

Forgive me, Gaetano, my everlasting repetitions ; but how can I help it ? For some time past I have been able only to say the same things over and over again. Now to-day puts me in mind of another day, a dear and solemn one in my memory. I recollect with unspeakable pleasure the solitary walk I took with my mother to speak of you. The stillness of the country, the fresh aspect of nature, the distant voices of the peasants, which alone at intervals broke the profound tranquillity, all seemed new to me, and all spoke to my heart. I can never forget the quiet little church where for the first time I ventured to pray God to bless these new thoughts,—thoughts which held me suspended, as it were, between a doubt and a hope, but in the midst of which I felt my heart fixed in its resolve to do the Divine Will in all things. From that day I have implored, and do constantly implore, the graces which we need in order to lead together a truly Christian life. Do you do the same, Gaetano ; and let me assure you that I find it impossible now to pray to God for myself without mingling your name in my supplications.

*April 30th.*

He only is worthy of a reward who has earned it by his merits. Do you not know that combat—and what is life but a continual combat ?—must precede victory ? No, we will not be like cowardly soldiers, who would fain have the honours of a triumph without having confronted the foe ; and let us strive to lay hold on eternal felicity, which alone can satisfy the longings of our souls, by faithfully performing all our duties, by supporting for the love of God all the trials of life, heavy or light, by devoting ourselves as much as

possible to good works ; then, Gaetano, the desire of Heaven will not be to us a dreamy ideal, or matter of vague speculation, but it will interpenetrate our life to sanctify it ; and may God give you length of days and rich opportunities to serve His cause by strong and enduring virtues.

*May 2nd.*

I believe that without setting before us a too ideal and, as it were, unattainable type of perfection, we can effect much by strenuously endeavouring to strengthen our will. Let us keep a watch over it, and never allow it to lean towards what is evil, even in the smallest things. Let us always remember those beautiful words of the Imitation : " If each year we corrected one fault, how soon we should become better ! " Yes, strength of will is always necessary, and not less in small trials than in great ones. In this, it seems to me, Christian perfection really consists ; for what can be more pleasing to God than to see our will always conformed to His ?

*May 30th.*

No affection which is not grounded in the love of God will make us happy. Let us be well assured of this, Gaetano, and dedicate our whole life to Him Who has done all for us. As for me, I believe that just as the external pomp of worship is of no value in the sight of God when separated from inward devotion, so works can do nothing to merit grace unless they are inwardly animated by a pure intention and the simple desire of pleasing God. So we must always pass on from what is without to what is within ; and this is what I mean when I tell you that I often use visible things as a sort of lever to raise me towards the invisible ; discerning in all that meets my eyes here below an image of that Eternal Beauty which unveils itself only to the intelligence and to the heart. Thus nothing remains voiceless to me. How many things the mountains tell me, and the stars, and the sea, and the trees, and the birds ! and none of these should I have known if the mighty voice of nature had not taught them me. Oh ! how admirable is the goodness of God, Who by so many and various ways is ever leading back our souls to the thoughts and the holy affections for which they were created.

I have been reading in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* this beautiful idea of Jean Paul Richter : " When that which is holy in the soul of the mother responds to that which is holy in the soul of the son, their souls meet and understand each other. " This thought has made a great impression on me ; and it seems to me to contain a grand lesson for those mothers who undertake the religious education of their sons. It shows us also the nature of those ties which bind us so closely to our relations and our friends. For, indeed, why do we love each other with such a true and constant love ? Because what is sacred to your soul is sacred also to mine. Why is it that I am so deeply moved when I hear of some noble action ? when I contemplate the greatness of this world's heroes, and, above all, the greatness of the saints and of the martyrs ? Why do I weep when I hear of the sacrifices they made with so much self-devotion and fortitude ? Because what they revered I revere also. How could more be said in so few words ? Yes,

every man ought to be continually feeding the heavenly fire which God has kindled in his heart. Unhappy he who lets it languish and die out. He loses its warmth for himself, and is himself lost to his brethren, for he has snapped asunder the bond of love which would have united him to them for ever. As the flame ascends on high,

“ Per la sua forma eh' è nata a salire,\*

so by nature our souls tend to rise towards God, and if they return again towards earth there is no longer for them either hope of peace or hope of happiness.

*July 19th, Feast of St. Vincent de Paul.*

Need I ask you what ought to be the object of our desires? Neither honours, nor riches, nor any such earthly vanities, which can add nothing to our peace. Or towards what end our will, strengthened by love, ought to turn? Well do you know it, and often have you taught it me. We ought to strive together to realize in our lives something of that perfection which can be attained only so partially on earth. We ought to look rather at the things that are immortal and eternal than at those of this changeful time, living in such manner that a true love of God may inform our very souls and thoughts, developing all our sentiments towards what is good, and directing all our actions to a holy end. What touching examples of virtue are recalled to us by the feast which this day brings! What an indefatigable and all-embracing charity was there in St. Vincent de Paul; what a lively and ardent piety; what boundless compassion for all the errors, all the faults, all the miseries, all the physical and moral sufferings of man; what invincible patience! Who among us will dare to say that he cannot reproduce in himself at least some faint shadow of these lovely virtues? If we cannot, like this illustrious saint, relieve the sufferings of thousands, at least we can be humble and patient, animated by that true spirit of religion which is always forgiving and loving, because it loves Him Who is all Mercy and all Love.

A writer of whom we wish to speak with all due courtesy, has recently favoured the reading public, in the pages of one of our ablest periodicals,† with the results of her observations and inquiries during “four limited periods of residence in different parts of Italy.” Those results are (in the writer’s opinion) extremely unfavourable in regard to the state of female education in that country. - Italian women are taught “languages and music;” and “much desire seems to exist to make this instruction as complete as possible. French and English are almost universally learned, and a small share of geography and history.” They read, it is true; but then it

---

\* “By its very nature, which is born to rise.”

*Dante: Purgatorio, cant. xviii.*

† *Macmillan's Magazine* for September, 1862.



is only such works as those of Dante and Tasso, for whom this lady writer appears to entertain but a slight esteem; and as for novels, they have none but "eternally dull ones," like the *"Promessi Sposi"* of Manzoni. "Of German, Greek, and Latin, nothing is known"—how large a proportion of her own countrywomen are in a state of similar ignorance, the fair author forgets to inform us. There "remains only English literature; and assuredly nothing better could be desired, if they were only free to profit by its resources." But then come in the governess, and the confessor, and the *Index Expurgatorius*; and if they are allowed a sight of "that charming new book," *"Uncle Tom's Cabin,"* it is only after "all its heretical theology" has been carefully expunged, and the quintessence of the story squeezed into "a pretty little abridgment of about fifty or sixty pages of manuscript." And then there is the Bible—which of course is not read in Italy either by rich or by poor. Consequently, in the matter of "intellectual life," and the "poetic feelings," and mental cultivation generally, the women of Italy are much below the level of their English sisters.

But this is far from being the sum of this lady's revelations. "It is actually a precept of the Church (she informs us) that matters of theology and divinity ought never to be talked of between laymen. Thus, then, a man may rightly admire the wonders of creation, may cast his eyes over all this glorious beauty of Italian earth and seas and skies; but when the thought comes to him of the God who made it, he must not turn to wife or friend and speak of that God. He may rightly addict himself to natural science, and pursue the chain as far as he may through its lower links, but never may he trace it upwards and bind it to the eternal throne. . . . Husband and wife, mother and child, sister and sister, may go through life's dark places side by side, but never may they talk by the way of Him who is guiding them."

There is much more of a similar character which we will not inflict upon our readers. The extract we have given will serve as an indication of the vast amount of arrant nonsense which clever, "liberal-minded" people talk when they suffer themselves to become the victims of their prejudices; and that, too, without a suspicion, apparently, that they are bearing false witness against their neighbours with a recklessness which exceeds all the ordinary bounds of—romancing. That Rosa Ferrucci's writings give token of no little "intellectual life" and "poetic feeling," cannot, we think, be matter of dispute; though they may abound with thoughts and aspirations which, as appertaining to a far higher sphere than that of the merely

sentimental and imaginative, may to an unsympathizing critic appear overwrought and high-flown. True it is that they do not deal with "matters of theology and divinity," if by theology and divinity be understood, as is probable, religious controversy; neither, it must be confessed, would the line of Rosa's studies have altogether accorded with that freedom of speculation in which the Protestant mind claims a right to indulge, seeing that one of her rules was "never to read a doubtful book." But how the following letters can be reconciled with the assertion that Italians are prohibited—by a *precept* of the Church, and therefore under pain of mortal sin—when looking on the beauty of nature, to speak of "the God who made it," is more than we are able to divine, and must leave to this lady and her literary sponsors to explain.

July 15th.

Sweet were the impressions, Gaetano, which our long walk yesterday in that beautiful garden left on my mind. Is it not true that the flowers and the trees and the deep blue sky, the pure sweet air, the songs of the birds and the hum of the insects—everything, in fact, spoke to us of God? I feel so deeply, too, that all those lovely things had more of joy in them to me, because thou wast there, and they all seemed to reflect the feelings of thy heart to me; and then, again, my heart had been moved by those beautiful words of my uncle G—— which my mother had read to us. Earth and heaven, flowers and songs, all seemed to me to form the harmony of those beautiful stanzas.

July 22nd.

I do not know the places you speak of, unless they are Romito and Antignano. I went as far as La Torre on foot, on a beautiful August morning, without much discomfort from the heat, which was tempered by the sea-breeze. After traversing that long steep road, which at every step grew more solitary as it became more and more hemmed in between the hills and the sea, I went to the top of the little fortress, and thence for a long time I gazed on the neighbouring islands, and the vast horizon where sea and sky seemed to unite; and I could even discern some of the lands of the Maremma. Another time, with the Plezza, the Gabrini, and other friends, we went as far as Romito. The sun had already sunk below the horizon. Every moment the last gleams of twilight were growing fainter and fainter, and soon the moon rose behind the hills. Her white rays were mirrored in the sea, on whose bosom lay one solitary fishing boat; and the murmur of the gentle waves, as they came slowly to break and die on the rocky shore, alone broke the silence of the evening. From time to time, we crossed the dry bed of one of those torrents which precipitate themselves from the mountains into the sea, and so now talking, now silent, gazing and admiring, we passed the two little towers, and having reached the boundary of the two communes, we stopped, and retraced our steps as if we had reached the Columns of Hercules. Here is a comparison that would please my good Luisa V——; only fancy her, in her last letter, gravely

comparing me to a navigator steering towards a new world ! Then she checks herself, and says, "No ; love is a world as old as the earth." That may be, my good Luisa ; but to me it is new, all new, Gaetano ; and I believe it will never grow old, like everything that comes directly from God, Who is Endless Duration in Eternal Youth.

*September 15th.*

It is drawing near, that dear October. If I cannot enjoy your ruralizing, it will be a happiness to think of the pleasure it will give you. You will see your mountains again, and those pine-groves which from a child I have always loved and admired. Amid the flowers, the plants, and the trees, you will think often of Him who has created us, and made us capable of loving the good and the beautiful ; of Him who this year has opened before you the horizon of a new life, wherein I trust you will never find regrets or thorns. Oh ! how easy, as it seems to me, does the beauty of the country make the love of God to us ! How sweet it is to think that the same God who sends the dews and fertilizing rains to the earth, and decks the trees with their foliage, and covers the fields with their flowers and their harvests, is also that Good Father who comforts us in our sorrows, and so sweetly invites our soul to come and take its rest in Him. Let me talk to thee of the Good God, Gaetano : I do so love to think of Him.

*September 25th.*

I cannot tell you what pleasure it is to me to gaze into the deep deep azure of the beautiful mornings, whose sweet air never intermits,\* and of the lovely evenings, when the stars seem to speak, and tell in a sacred language the wisdom of God. The country does good to our souls. In admiring its ever new riches and beauty, we are the more easily led to think that if earth was created for man, man was created for the love of God. I often say to myself, what will heaven be, if there is so much beauty on this poor earth, where we are rather pilgrims than dwellers ? . . .

On the eve of St. John all Florence was illuminated. There was nothing but merry-making and noisy laughter among the people ; every one was gazing eagerly at the illuminations and the fireworks, but no one thought of admiring the most beautiful ornament of the feast—I mean the moon, whose tremulous rays were reflected in the Arno, and deepened the long shadows of the trees.

*September 28th.*

Next year we will go to the country together. If you only knew how I love your mountains, with their tall pines, their flowers, their streams, and their green summits ! I always remember the moment when I left them. It was a November morning ; the faint rays of a cloud-veiled sun shed a pale

---

\* "Un' aura dulce, senza mutamento."

"A pleasant air  
That intermitted never, never veer'd."

*Cary's Dante : Purgatory, cant. xxviii.*

light on the horizon, the leaves were falling from the trees, the snow of the day before still covered the summits ; all was sad and solitary around. Who could have told me that to this melancholy spot, which I was leaving as a child, I should return with thee a happy bride ?

October 23rd.

I hope you are enjoying your ruralizing (*villeggiatura*), Gaetano. The pleasures of the country are a thousand times sweeter than those of the town. How pleasant it is of an evening to climb the heights, and thence behold the grand expanse of heaven still purpled by the sun's last rays ; and at one's feet the fields, the pine groves, the pale olives, the trees with their autumnal tints, the little scattered cottages of the peasants, with the smoke of their evening fires rising from the roofs, and the village church, which seems by the tolling of its bell to "weep the dying day :—"

"Il giorno pianger che si muore."

I am far from all this now, but I constantly think of it. I see in my mind's eye that lovely day at Cuccigliana, our mountain walk, and the clear horizon, with its luminous depths, which promised me a joyous future. How many things nature can say ; how she can speak to the heart ! How, above all, she can speak to it of God ! Flowers, hills, woods, earth and sky, how much more beautiful they all are when we learn to discern in them the beauty of God ! How many times have I taken again with you, Gaetano, that walk of ours on the Serchio, where our long talks together had no accompaniment save the rustling of the leaves. Oh ! may God bless thee ; may He make thee happy, and all the desires of thy Rosa will be satisfied.

Rosa Ferrucci was an ardent Italian ; she was thoroughly versed in the history of her own country ; and in the days of Charles Albert, ere the house of Piedmont had so utterly lost its faith and dragged its honour in the dust, her father and brother had taken up arms in its behalf. But she was not the less a fervent Catholic ; and we may safely say that she would have shrunk with horror from the outrages to the Holy See and to the bishops, priests, and religious, which have been perpetrated in the name of liberty and national independence. On one occasion she writes thus :—

In considering the history of nations, we discover at every step new and infallible proofs of the wisdom and omnipotence of Him who directs the affairs of the world—of that mysterious justice which is as far above all human understanding as heaven is above the earth. Hope then in the Lord, ye victims of oppression ! Recognize the hand which alone can give you deliverance. And you, usurpers of the rights of the vanquished, triumph not without trembling at the tears you have made to flow. He lives, and will live for ever, who will never remain deaf to the lamentations of His people Israel. If His justice tarry, ought you to cease believing in Him ? Because He waits with patience, ought that to encourage you in your daring ? Do you forget that God is long-suffering, because He is Eternal ?

The letter that follows shows us this young girl at her studies. We see in it the natural expression of her great love for intellectual and literary pursuits ; but we see also that she did not allow study to entrench upon the time which she thought it right to devote to the more humble employment of needlework ; and that no other ambition mingled itself with the cultivation of letters, but that of making herself a fitter intellectual companion for her future husband :—

I do not think we shall lose by the exchange, when, on finishing Milton, we shall read Virgil together. That great man appears to me indeed “the light and the honour of other poets,” as our Dante says. This reading will afford us the great advantage of being able to compare the principal episodes of the *Æneid* with the best passages in other poems. I assure you I do not regret the time I devote to my little studies. If I had to begin them anew, I should only apply myself to them with more attention and diligence. I owe to them some of my best pleasures ; but, above all, I owe to them community of intellectual life with you. I know no more lively pleasure than that of shutting myself up in my little room with my books and my pen ; and during the hours which I ought, and which I am resolved to give to needlework, I love still to think of my reading, and to beguile the time by those profitable reminiscences.

It may be argued, perhaps, that Rosa Ferrucci was one of those richly endowed beings, rarely met with in any country, and who can scarcely be taken as a specimen of a class. But it is evident from her correspondence, that she by no means felt herself isolated ; and if she was singular, as doubtless she was, in her superior talents and acquirements, she was not so either in her intellectual tastes or in the turn of her mind. She had many friends of her own sex capable of appreciating her character and sharing her pleasures. One such we have already met with in Luisa V——. Rosa was not a person to waste her time and affections in frivolous intimacies, and when we find her writing in the following terms to a certain favoured Maria, we may form a pretty clear idea of what Maria must have been :—

*Antignano, July, 1853.*

In spite of our joy at being here, believe me, my dear Maria, we feel your absence sadly. The recollection of our happiness last year casts a shade of melancholy over our present enjoyment. I speak from my heart, Maria ; I should be so happy if I had you near me. Come back to us then, dear friend. The little wood in which we passed such happy hours, the great shady trees, the smiling country, and the sea—all call you back. Not two days ago I heard a wave bounding towards the shore, and saying to me, “Come, come down, young girl, from the flowery strand, into this calm sea ; the sun invites you, brightening earth and water with his brilliant rays.” But the mermaid’s song was suddenly interrupted, for the poor wave broke upon a rock. All

its sister wavelets seemed to chaunt the same song of invitation ; but all, like the first, soon broke upon the shore ; and I grew pensive at the sight ; for these poor dissolving waves seemed to me a true image of our shattered hopes, which cost us so many tears. But then a clear little voice murmured sweetly in my ear, "Take courage, why are you sad? Cannot Maria come back? I am your good friend *Hope*. Listen to me and trust me. I promise thee next year Maria shall be here." So this consoled me a little, for I always believe what my good friend *Hope* says to me. Courage and patience, then, and I am sure of one day having you at Antignano. Dear Maria, forgive this letter, which is as long as it is foolish ; and if you cannot understand it, seek in it only a new proof of my tender affection for you. Let us now leave the world of dreams, and enter that of news . . . .

Of two of her friends, who died young, she speaks with a touching sorrow in her letters to her betrothed, one being the pious and accomplished daughter of Manzoni :—

I have just learnt the death of a very dear friend. Young, beautiful, brought up in opulence, the only daughter of a mother who idolized her, she wished to become a Sister of Charity, in order to serve God in His poor. For ten years she was the tenderest of mothers to orphans, and she has died in the flower of her days. Dear, good Sister Maria, how happy I should be to see her again ! I am always thinking of her. Schiller would say, "Cease to weep ; tears do not raise the dead." But the words which the Redeemer addressed to the afflicted come with a far different power to the heart : "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted !" The more I meditate on these words, and the more I look on earth in all its springtide freshness—the pure light and the deep azure of the skies—the more I am impressed, death notwithstanding, with the infinite goodness of God, and the ineffable joy of the life to come. I hear men say that the wicked oppress the good ; I often see good people in misfortune, but will not they also have their day and their reward ? How often of an evening, when I raise my eyes towards the twinkling stars, I think of the happy souls who are there on high, higher than the stars, in the everlasting enjoyment of the beatific vision, of adoration and of love unfading. If men would but keep their souls fixed on such thoughts, what is there on this earth that could then discourage them ?

More sorrow—Matilda\* is dead ! Oh, how we loved her ! What an angel she was ! It is we who suffer ; for to her it is pure happiness to have quitted earth. Never did a murmur escape her ; she found all strength and all peace in the love of God. Her soul so easily opened itself to joy. The day before she died they brought her a bouquet of flowers. "What beautiful things our God has made," was all she said. Her friends wished to warn her father of her imminent danger ; but she always opposed it, wishing to spare her poor father the agony of a last farewell.

I have not yet seen the introduction you speak of. My mother has read me those admirable verses of Manzoni's, which are prefixed to it. They

---

\* Matilda Manzoni, daughter of the celebrated author.



recall so many things to my mind that they have powerfully affected me. As my memory reverted to the days that are past, I seemed to hear the sweet voice of my poor Matilda, who, in reciting his poetry, evinced all the tender admiration she felt for her father's genius. We were at Viareggio ; it was a beautiful summer evening ; Matilda said to me, " Rosa, if you could only tell me the first verse of that stanza I am sure I could repeat the rest." For some time I ransacked my poor memory in vain, when all of a sudden came the word *Soffermati*. It was enough. Matilda repeated to me, without a mistake—and with what expression !—the entire piece of poetry. My poor friend ! she is no longer with us, and we shall never meet on earth again. When I left her, I said " *A rivederci* in a few days ;" I ought to have said, " *A rivederci in heaven*". . . . .

It has been often observed that one side of a correspondence really displays both ; and thus though none of the letters of the beloved Gaetano are given to us, we nevertheless obtain considerable insight into his mind and character. He knew that God had given him a great gift, and he cherished it. Gentle and submissive as Rosa was, she—as gentle and submissive women generally do—unconsciously guided the stronger nature. It is evident that Gaetano did not fill his letters with those expressions of admiration and passionate affection with which—*selon les règles*—a man's love-letters are supposed to abound. Rosa was already his friend and adviser. Into the ear of this young girl were poured the griefs and interior trials of a man engaged in the stir and strife of the world, and suffering from its depressing influences. And how exquisitely does she apply the healing balm, and refresh his drooping spirit :—

July 10th.

Let us not be discouraged, Gaetano ; let us always hope. The good God will help us to become better ; for if we lack strength, at least we are not wanting in good desires. They are the free gift of Him who wills our good—of Him who has given us the most living example of humility, and who will assuredly pardon the weakness of our poor nature, if only we will continue to fight against it with that perseverance which alone has the promise of victory. Ah ! believe me, if we loved the Lord truly, we should think only of Him—of Him, so holy and perfect—and should not be for ever thinking of ourselves, weak, miserable creatures ; and we should end by forgetting ourselves, by losing ourselves, to live only in Him, so worthy of our love ; and thus should we come truly to know that we are nothing, and that He is all. Jesus wills that we be gentle with ourselves, and not be cast down when the frailty of our nature makes us fail in our good resolutions. At times when we are too much dejected at the sight of our poor weaknesses, Jesus Christ seems to say to us, as to the disciples going to Emmaus, " Why converse ye together thus, and are sad ?" He who is called the Prince of Peace wishes us to be peaceable and gentle with ourselves, and to have compassion on our own infirmity. When, then, we are seized with sadness at the sight of our

poverty, and the dryness of our souls, let us say simply and humbly, with S. Catherine of Genoa, "Alas ! my Lord, behold the fruits of my garden. And yet I love thee, my Jesus ; and I will strive to do better for the future."

I received your dear letter this morning, Gaetano, and that you may not suppose that I thought it too gloomy, I must tell you that I also have been thinking of death the whole day. Indeed I offered a special prayer to the Lord to be merciful to me when the hour comes for passing from time to eternity, and, as I hope, "from the human to the Divine." We ought to throw ourselves, once for all, with childlike confidence, into the arms of God, if we would keep alive in our hearts the hope of seeing in heaven Him whom we adore on earth. For my part, if instead of thinking of Him alone, I were to turn to think of myself, I hardly know to what depths my reflections might sink me. But hope, which is a Christian virtue, is the firm expectation of future glory. And so I will forget my fears, and believe that, in spite of our imperfections, we may one day taste, in the bosom of God, a happiness of the very shadow of which we cannot so much as catch a glimpse here on earth. We shall then know in what overflowing measure the Lord rewards even the feeblest efforts of His friends. We shall know how everything here below was inevitably passing away with ourselves—that this earthly life was vanishing with more than the lightness of a dream—so that nothing remains to man after death but love, that ethereal part of the soul which God claims all for Himself. Nay, more ; I believe that the love which shall unite and blend together our souls on high, will not be absorbed in the contemplation of the Divine Essence in such wise that the sweetness of still loving each other shall be unfelt and unheeded. On the contrary, I believe that the triumph of love will be to exist and to endure in God, and to unite in the same canticle of praise the souls which He has made to love one another.

*August 4th.*

May I tell you, Gaetano, what I have been thinking of with regard to our future life ? We ought first, as we have so often said, to keep always before us the Will of God, endeavour to fulfil it in everything, and submit ourselves to it with our inmost heart. We shall have but one heart and one soul—shall we not ?—in serving God ; and I hope, too, that we shall have but one heart in loving our dear parents. How ungrateful we should be if in our happiness we forgot those who have done so much for us—who loved us before we knew what love was ! Let us strive so to regulate the affections of our heart that one shall not be stifled by another, but that all, combining in sweet harmony, may rise towards Him who has created them, and for whom we ought to live. May He alone be the end of all our acts and thoughts ! Then will our troubles never exceed our courage, our duties will never seem too heavy for us, our lives will be holy, our intentions single, and even here we shall know interior peace—that peace which he knows not who has not experienced it. This is the plan of life I have been thinking of, but which I have scarcely ventured to sketch, fearing I might seem to be prescribing rules to you. The grace of God alone can make all this possible to us. Let us ask it through

the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, on the approaching feast of her Assumption ; we need so much her protection and counsels.

“Orando grazia convien che s’ impetri,  
Grazia da quella, che puote aiutarti.”\*

Our readers will doubtless have been struck with the pensive melancholy which pervades this young girl’s letters. Some may even be disposed to reckon her gravity of disposition as unnatural at so tender an age ; and, remembering her early death, will be led perhaps to the conclusion that her approaching departure cast its penumbra over her youthful spirit. But this, we believe, would be to mistake her whole character. To us Rosa’s soul would seem to have been a very well-spring of joy, and her feelings alive to the freshest and most pleasurable impressions. No doubt her piety and the tenderness and richness of her imagination imparted a peculiar earnestness to her cast of thought, but we are bold to say that seriousness of mind is natural to youth, where nature has not been thwarted or perverted by education. True, youth is joyous and loves sport, but this is nowise inconsistent with intense seriousness and earnestness of mind. Because young people like to be amused, and have a keen relish of enjoyment—because with them impressions quickly succeed one another, the grave and the gay, smiles and tears, following fast on each other and often mingling together—it were an error to charge them, therefore, with a spirit of levity. Youth is thoughtless and heedless—not because it cannot feel deeply, not because it is incapable of earnest and intense musing—but because the age is not one of reflection, and because of the facility and rapidity with which one mood of mind displaces another.

Youth naturally detests levity, banter, and ridicule. Who has not observed the almost pettish indignation of a child when put off with a jest instead of a serious answer ? Childhood is intensely serious, and half-grown-up childhood partakes of the same character. All the recipient portion of our nature is at that age in the most active state of development. It is impressible to an almost morbid degree. The imagination and fancy are so vivid and so rich, that the young would be far the best poets, if reflection and the other intellectual faculties kept pace with the imagination. As it is, we make better poets at a more sober age, when we feel less vividly, but are able to apply more attention and reflection to what we feel, or rather

---

\* “Grace then must first be gain’d ;  
Her grace, whose might can help thee.”

*Cary’s Dante : Paradise, cant. xxxii.*

what we *have felt*—for the poet commonly writes more under remembered than present impressions.

Nevertheless we are free to confess there *is* a great spirit of levity amongst our youth. It betrays itself in the conventional light handling of almost every topic. Conversations and letters are alike seasoned with it; quizzing, banter, ridicule have made clear decks of sentiment. That object of our special aversion, the “off-hand” young lady, is the special production of modern times; and if *she* is natural, assuredly Rosa Ferrucci was a consummate piece of affectation. But is *she* natural? We believe she is pre-eminently the reverse. We believe that little that is natural ever escapes her lips or her pen; we would not do her the injustice to believe that the heartless frivolities to which she habitually gives utterance truly represent the feelings and aspirations of her young soul. No; these are buried far beneath the surface—driven into their hiding-places at first in self-defence from the ungenial atmosphere which they would have encountered on venturing forth, but soon habitually suppressed and stifled in deference to the stern rule of a despotic conventionality; just so much of serious and earnest feeling being suffered to appear as may serve to interest and please, without incurring the reproach of sentimentalism or romance. No doubt there are degrees in the amount of the evil, but we are convinced that it is so widely extended and so tyrannous in its action that few escape its influence.

If, then, we desire to witness amongst our daughters the characteristics which adorned this sweet flower of foreign growth—if we wish them to exhibit graces similar in kind, if not equal in degree—we must, we are persuaded, return to the old type of education—not, of course, to the old forms: they cannot always be preserved; nor is it desirable that they should. But the type, the Catholic type, can never vary; nor can woman’s sphere of life essentially change. At present we seem to be cultivating the least sweet portions of her nature; we are bringing her up, not for retirement, not for home, but for a certain publicity;—for the world, in short, where it is impossible to cultivate “the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptibility of a quiet and meek spirit, which is rich in the sight of God.” While this is so we can have little cause to complain, or at least to wonder, that women who aspire after perfection are to be sought almost exclusively in religion; and that the plant which flourishes elsewhere under the common influences of sun and shower, is here an exotic, which our cold winds and sunless skies forbid to struggle into bloom.

The two years of happy betrothal had passed away. Rosa was nineteen, and 1857 was to witness the union of these two beings, who indeed seemed to be made for each other. On New Year's-day Rosa writes thus :—

*January 1st, 1857.*

Let us pray God with all our hearts, to-day, Gaetano, to bless our union, our souls, our actions, our thoughts, our life. May He vouchsafe long to preserve to us those who are dear, to shield us from great misfortunes, and, above all, never to withdraw His grace from us. These are the prayers we will together offer, united in heart, though separated by distance. God will see the sincerity of our desires, and will hear and answer them. The bright, clear sky gladdens all nature, and rejoices our souls also, who in the light of the sun see as it were a reflection of the Increated Light. I do not think I am superstitious, Gaetano, for if the new year had begun in the midst of thunder and lightning and dismal rains, I certainly should not have augured ill for our future. But, now, contemplating the pure serenity of the heavens and of the whole horizon, I ask God to give us a life like to this beautiful day, so that nothing shall ever trouble in our souls that peace which has its source in God, its everlasting fount.

And so a cloudless future seemed to be opening from a cloudless past. Since the death of the young friends about whom she had written, sorrow had not touched her; her pensive cast of thought arose from her deep sympathy for others. But it was not to be. In the midst of that summer's cloudless sky her sun went down. A strange presentiment hung about her. On January 21st, three days before the beginning of her illness, she wrote thus :—

Truly we ought always to be ready to die, when and as God wills, and to love Him infinitely above all the things of this world, which pass away with our frail life. Our immortal soul was not made for earth where all is passing away, dissolving and changing; by the very essence of its nature it longs for Heaven. For me, living or dead, in this world or the next, I will be ever thine, my Gaetano, in the love that God knows and blesses.

This letter was the last that Rosa Ferrucci wrote.

We will give the last most touching scene almost in the words of her French biographer.

The heavenly instinct had not deceived her; two days after that on which she wrote the foregoing letter, death had breathed upon her—a mortal taint was in her veins. She was taken with a slight fever, which at first was such as to cause no alarm, save to the ever-anxious heart of a mother. But on the very first day Rosa said to her, "Take my little desk, and keep it as a remembrance of me." Such words were startling, coming from one so clear-sighted. All at once the illness

assumed an alarming character; and the doctors recognised it as *miliare*, a terrible epidemic which at the time was desolating Tuscany, and seemed to pick out the choicest victims. The young invalid had divined her danger, and asked for the last sacraments, which she received with the most humble and tender piety. She now rallied a little. "Grand and beautiful day!" she said; "if I am restored to life, never shall I forget it. What strength there is in the Holy Viaticum! Dear mother, how sweet and consoling is our religion! Oh, believe me, if any one feared death, he could fear it no longer after having received the Blessed Eucharist!" Then she called her betrothed: "Gaetano," she said, "if it be the good pleasure of God to unite us on earth, He will restore me; but if He has other designs regarding us, then, my Gaetano, we must resign ourselves and adore His holy Will; must we not?" The young man could not speak. She went on: "In my English prayer-book you will find a thanksgiving for the Holy Viaticum; take the book and read it to me;" and a voice trembling with sorrow began to read the well-known beautiful words: "Glory and thanksgiving be to Thee, O Lord, who, in Thy sweetness, hast been pleased to visit and refresh my poor soul. Now let Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word. Now Thou art come to me, and I will not let Thee go; now I willingly bid farewell to the world, and with joy I come to Thee, my God." &c.

When the reader's voice had ceased, the sufferer wished to sleep a little; but she soon roused herself, and continued to pray. One of her brothers was expected from Florence. "Settle the room," said she to her mother, "and put back on my table the things that were taken off it when it was made into an altar. I do not wish poor Antonio to perceive, on entering, that I have received the last sacraments; but be sure, dear mother, always look on that little table as a sacred thing, for it has borne the Body of Jesus Christ." All through this day she held her mother's hand, and spoke of nothing but the joy of having received her Lord. Towards evening she remembered that she was to have visited such and such poor people on that day; this thought troubled her, and she was only quieted by the assurance, that before night some one should go and take them their accustomed relief. She now began to hold converse with our Lord, and to speak to Him with an ardour which the intenseness of her sufferings seemed to render only the more fervent. "O Jesus, this bed is like fire to me—but no, I will not complain: Thou wouldst have me to serve Thee in suffering, and in suffering I will serve Thee. Thou knowest I should not grieve to die, were it



not for the great sorrow my loss will cause to those who love me. If Thou seest that I should make a good Christian wife, I would say, 'Lord, heal me.' But what is it I am asking? No! Thy Will be done, not mine."

In the middle of the night, seeing the shadow of her mother still leaning at her bed's head, she exclaimed, "O the heroic love of mothers!" She thought so much of the least thing that was done for her. "My poor father! My poor mother! What care they take of me! They deprive themselves of sleep for my sake. They have no thought but for me. Mother, what say you of my Gaetano? Now, indeed, do I feel how happy I should have been with him; for the more I know him, the more I feel he loves me—as you love me." Then she asked to have prayers said by her bedside, and began herself to repeat in a low tone the prayers for the dying. Her mother interrupted her: "Rosa, my child, why these sorrowful prayers? You will recover, my child; do not be always thinking of death." She replied, "Ah! but if I have not been able to think of anything but death all the day long! If Jesus wishes to take me, must I not get ready?" Her sufferings were great; for a moment nature prevailed, and she gave utterance to a complaint. Her betrothed said to her, "Rosa, think of what our Lord suffered." "Thanks, Gaetano: how that thought consoles me!"

The next day's dawn only brought an accession of the malady. Three skilful physicians saw that all their efforts were powerless against the disease. One of them, who loved Rosa as his own child, shed tears. The poor sufferer became delirious. "Let us go, let us go," she cried; "adieu, dear mother; my home is not here, my home is above! Let us go, let us go, adieu." These words she repeated, sometimes in French, sometimes in Italian. Her compassionate disposition showed itself even in the ravings of delirium. Now it was a poor desolate widow over whom she mourned. Next it was a poor little orphan child whom she took weeping into her arms. Then she seemed to see the ladder of Jacob, and exclaimed, "But I—am I pure enough to go up with these angels? May I step forward? May I take a part in their choirs—I who was making ready for earthly espousals?" She then came to herself, and asked for a chapter of the *Fioretti* of S. Francis on holy perseverance. While they were reading it, she cried out suddenly, as if struck with horror and dismay, "O the evil spirits, the evil spirits!" Her mother threw her arms round her, pressed her to her heart, and said, "Listen to your mother, Rosa, my dear child; why these cries? why these terrors? You need not fear the bad spirits, dear child; and

they are not devils, but the angels of heaven that surround your bed. Have you not always loved God? Have you not always loved the poor? Have you not been a good and obedient child?" But her face grew stern, and she said, "Silence: tempt me not to pride;" and the shadow of a deep and austere humility passed over her face.

Her delirium returned with increased violence: nothing could calm her. When all resources had failed, the poor mother said, "Rosa, my dear, I am quite exhausted; if you could calm yourself a little, I could rest my head on your hands and sleep. Calm yourself, my child, for my sake." And saying this, she affected to drop asleep; from that moment the poor child was silent. Love was stronger than delirium. A long state of stupor followed: her face became as pale as ivory; the veil of death seemed to fall over her brow; the victim was ready. But there is no victim without sacrifice; and there is no sacrifice without pain. Jesus trembled, and wept, and was sorrowful even to death in Gethsemane. The hour of agony was come for this young Christian: she felt the cold iron of the sword; but again Divine love remained victorious. All at once she came to herself, and opened her large terrified eyes; the life which had been fast ebbing away now returned with an impetuous flow, sending the blood rushing to her cheek, and lighting up her countenance with a preternatural brilliancy. She seemed to awake out of a dream, and then for the first time to understand all. "It must be, then," she cried, "it must be; I must die. I must leave my father's house; I must leave my betrothed! No, no, I am to live with him; I am to make him happy!" Tears flowed in torrents down her cheeks, a cry strong as love burst from her heart. "Farewell, Gaetano, farewell; we shall see each other no more." The struggle was terrible in that poor heart. The funeral shroud was to take the place of the gay wedding-dress. The bride seemed to twine her dying fingers in her nuptial wreath, and to clasp it convulsively—but, if it be God's will? Her mother put to her lips a picture of our Lady of Good Counsel which the young girl had near her bed. She kissed it. Instantly she grew calm, joined her hands together, bowed down her head, and remained perfectly silent. What was it that passed at that moment in the inmost sanctuary of that beautiful soul? The eye of God alone, infinitely holy, can read such secrets. All we know is that, after a long silence, the dying girl said, with a firm, clear voice, "*Fiat voluntas tua.*" And from that moment the name of Gaetano was never again upon her lips.

She recited the Litany of our Lady. At the invocation,

"*Janua cœli, ora pro nobis,*" she pressed her mother's hands, and smiled. Did she then see the eternal doors opening? The Prior of San Sisto, her confessor, was by her bedside. She asked for Extreme Unction, and answered distinctly to all the prayers. Then she cried, "This is the Christian's resurrection; thanks be to Thee, O my God. Oh, now I am very happy." A wonderful grace of peace and strength seemed from this moment to have filled her soul. She no longer needed comfort: it was she who consoled and comforted those around her. The poor mother, wild with grief, threw herself on her bosom. "Still do I hope," said she, sobbing. "Yes, my Rosa, I hope still you will recover; but if God does not will it, pray Him, implore Him, to take me also. I will not, I cannot live without you." And Rosa replied, "No, mother, you must not desire death; you have too many duties to perform on earth; remember the mother of the Maccabees." Then, stretching out her hand, and laying it on her sorrowing parent's head, she said, "I bless her who so often has blessed me. O Mary, change the sorrow of this poor mother into the consolation of the poor, the afflicted, and the sick; and do Thou, O my God, grant that unto the end we may adore Thy Divine decrees." She drew a little ring from her finger, and said, "Mother, keep this in remembrance of me." Then, placing in her hands the ring of her betrothal, she said, "Give it to—you know who—it is a noble soul." But she never named him.

The end drew near. Her relations and friends surrounded the bed; and every one was weeping. She said, smiling, "You are all around me; I am very glad—thanks." Then, suddenly, "Who wishes to have my hair?" No one ventured to answer. She cast a long half-reproachful look on the weeping faces round her. A voice cried, "*I do!*" Rosa recognized it, and said "My mother shall have it!"

She made a sign to the Prior to come to her, and said to him in a whisper, "Pray return this evening to my poor mother, and do all you can to console her." And then she seemed to retire to the feet of God, henceforth to speak to Him alone. "I suffer, my Jesus; but all for Thy love! I fear not hell, because I love Thee too much! I am on fire! I am in flames! Jesus, do Thou burn me, do Thou consume me in the flames of Thy love!" These holy ejaculations with difficulty found utterance—her voice was fast failing. Yet once again, and for the last time, she rallied: death had a hard struggle with the strength of her innocent youth. This time the dying girl spoke the very language of the saints; and her farewell to earth was worthy of a S. Catherine of Siena: "Lord,"

she said, "bless all men; bless this city of Pisa; bless her people, her bishops, and her pastors; bless the Catholic Church; bless her Sovereign Pontiff; bless her ministers and her children. Have pity on poor sinners; enlighten heretics; be merciful to those who believe in Thee; be merciful also to those who believe not. Pardon all; be a loving Father to the good, and to the wicked. O Immaculate Virgin, have pity on my soul! O Jesus, give to all Thy peace!—peace I leave to them." She was silent; a veil came over her eyes; they no longer beheld the things of earth, but a better light began to dawn upon them. "Yes, yes," she murmured, "I see now; I begin to see the holy Jerusalem. O the angels! O how many angels! how beautiful! Yes, certainly, willingly, my God! Where am I? Who calls me? Where then? Let us go, let us leave this, O my God! Let us go—on, on! *Andiamo! andiamo! avanti!*" The words died on her lips; she made the sign of the cross, kissed the crucifix, and, while mortal eyes still sought her on earth, she was following the Lamb in the eternal choirs of the Virgins.

Many words would but mar the impressive solemnity of the scene at which we have just been present; but one remark we will venture upon. Rosa Ferrucci is an example of how saints live and how saints die. The annals of sanctity abound in examples of divine love triumphing over earthly affections; but here we have an example of its triumph in the midst of earthly affections. For it is the glory of Christianity to have made the heart of man capable of loving more, and better than ever, all that is loveable on earth, and at the same time capable of always loving it less than God. The death of the just is not a mere act of resignation, it is a sacrifice; and Rosa Ferrucci's earthly love only furnished the matter of that sacrifice. The young bride of Pisa gives up her nuptial crown to embrace her Heavenly Spouse. There are tears—there are the pangs of a last farewell—there is one dear name that lingers on her lips almost to the confines of Eternity. She wished not for death, she did but obey its call; yet even here we meet with the same unvarying signs that mark the departure of God's chosen ones; even here there is a willing sacrifice and a victim of love.

## ART. V.—THE WORK AND THE WANTS OF THE. CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

*An Account of the State of the Roman-Catholic Religion throughout the World. Written for the use of Pope Innocent XI., by Monsignor Cerri, Secretary of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide. Now first translated from an authentick Italian MS. never published. To which is added a Discourse concerning the State of Religion in England; written in French in the time of King Charles I., and now first translated. With a large Dedication to the present Pope, giving Him a very particular account of the State of Religion amongst Protestants; and of several other matters of importance relating to Great Britain. By Sir Richard Steele. London: Printed for J. Roberts, near the Oxford Arms, in Warwick Lane. MDCCXV.*

**M**ORE than a generation of men has passed away since the emancipation of the Catholic Church in Great Britain from the persecution of the penal laws; and nearly half a generation since the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy. We have reached, therefore, a time when we may review the condition of the Church in this country. The silent and gradual expansion of a tree may escape the eye from moment to moment, but in a series of years its breadth of shadow and its rising stature reveal the accumulation of its life and power. So with the Church in England. After a series of vicissitudes more rapid, abrupt, and various than Christianity has ever known in any other land, the Catholic Church goes forth once more to evangelize the English people. England has been Pagan and Christian, then Pagan and Christian again, then Catholic in all the docility of childlike obedience, then indocile in all the pretensions of its national pride, though Catholic still; then reformed (so-called), with all the alternations of action and re-action from continental Protestantism to Hierarchical Anglicanism, from Latitudinarianism to Pietism, from an imitative Catholicism to a thorough Rationalism, which is now spreading on all sides under the foundations of English society. Meanwhile the Church has been twice all but extinct, and twice restored in power.

For the purpose of bringing out more clearly these facts of Divine Providence we have prefixed to this article the title of a work which was published in the last century. It presents us with one of those historical pictures which read like a fiction. To the Catholics of this day, and even to our

Protestant antagonists, it will seem hardly credible that the account of the Roman Catholic religion in England, which now would fill a volume, should be despatched in about a dozen octavo pages; and even of these, three-fourths at least are occupied with an account of the schism under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, and of the appointment of first an Archpriest, and then of a Vicar Apostolic for the whole of England. The description of the actual state of religion in England is contained in a few sentences: "I shall only say, in general, that there are many Catholics in the country at this present time; but that their number is not very considerable if compared with that of the heretics, who are divided into Church of England men, Presbyterians, Quakers, Anabaptists, Independents, and several other sects. The exercise of the Catholic religion is wholly prohibited both in public and in private. The Catholics meet together in some few places to perform Divine worship, but they do so with the utmost secrecy, and not without great danger." It seems incredible that such should have been our state only a century ago. What we purpose in this article, then, is to take a slight survey, by way of contrast, of our present condition, and that rather with a practical view, and for the sake of stimulating zeal and activity, than as a matter of mere literary speculation.

The history of England exhibits in a wonderful way the action of the Church upon the world, and their irreconcilable conflict. It was the Church that civilized England, united its races, founded and consecrated its monarchy. The Church has a twofold mission to mankind. Its first and primary, indeed, is to save souls, to lead men to eternal life. Its second, but no less true, is to ripen and to elevate the social and political life of men by its influences of morality and of law. As the Church is not a mere school of opinion for the enlightenment of the intellect, but a true kingdom for the government of the will, so its mission is not only to direct the conscience and the will of individuals as units, but of fathers as the heads of households, and of princes or governors as the rulers of people and of nations. Hence, by the Divine law of its mission to mankind, arises what is called the social and political status of the Church. The Holy See, in creating Christian Europe, contracted social and political relations with the civil society which it had called into existence. The Church in England formed an integral and vital part of the social and political order of the Saxon races,—permeating its whole structure and life: it anointed their princes, legislated in their parliaments, judged in their tribunals; and being thus intimately united with the whole public life and social order



of the people, the Church accomplished more pervadingly and more uniformly its spiritual mission in guiding men to eternal life. The theory of unconsecrated civil powers, occupied only with the temporal welfare of the people, was unknown to our Saxon forefathers, and would have been rejected by them as an impiety and a folly. True, indeed, it is that civil society has no Divine mission to the souls of men, no custody of revealed truths or laws, no supernatural discernment of what is for the eternal welfare of its members, no faculties to apply itself to the care of souls, nor any authority to direct the conscience. Nevertheless, a State has higher duties than that of conferring purely temporal benefits; and the Church, in consecrating the civil order by the grace of Christianity, enables it to promote the welfare of its people by a discernment and by means which are above its own. Such was eminently the state of Saxon England.

The Anglo-Saxon monarchy belongs to a Christian and patriarchal period, and hardly enters into the text of modern history. It is, like the source of the Nile, hidden but prolific, a mighty and productive cause, but withdrawn from sight. From it descend the unwritten laws, traditions, customs, and characteristic spirit of England in all its ages and in its full maturity. The Norman period, if it be more historical, and more within the range of our cognizance and our criticism, is, nevertheless, a time of culmination and of decline. The English monarchy grew strong; the English Church grew weak. The Saxon period expired in S. Edward, King and Confessor, who symbolized the spirit of that most beautiful age; the Norman reached its full development in Henry VIII., the offspring and the representative of its anti-Catholic spirit and traditions. Nevertheless, in the five centuries of the Norman-English rule, the Church created for itself a vast, mature, and powerful organization for the discharge of its civil mission to the people of England. It participated in all the political life and action, the domestic and foreign policy, the legislative and judicial power, of the monarchy. It had a rich inheritance of ecclesiastical endowments, it accumulated a vast multitude of eleemosynary foundations, it formed and directed a noble and abundant system of education in all its branches and for all classes of the people. The grammar-schools of England, the higher, or, as we call them, the public schools, and the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, were an ample and worthy provision for the education of a people less than three millions in number.

Now, of all these the Reformation robbed the Catholic Church at one blow. It was simply exiled from political

power, and put out of the sphere of the social life of England. Its pastors were driven from the councils of state. They were excluded from all share in the legislation and the government of the realm. Its charitable institutions were taken away, and its schools and universities turned against itself. It is not possible to conceive the state of privation and of poverty to which the Church was reduced. In France, the Protestants were a small minority, who withdrew from the institutions and culture of a Catholic nation. All the accumulated resources of spiritual and intellectual cultivation possessed by the Church of France remained with it still, because the French nation continued faithful. In England all was the reverse—the Catholics were the minority. They were spoiled of all that their fathers had created and accumulated. All the culture, maturity, and intellectual development of the English people, with all the instruments and means of its progress and expansion, remained in the hands of the anti-Catholic majority. It would be difficult to overstate the effects of this spoliation. The Emperor Julian showed the true instinct of an apostate in closing the Christian schools; and the Tudor princess manifested the same subtlety in robbing the Catholics of England of the means of intellectual culture. The true way to weaken an antagonist is to despoil him of the means of knowledge and cultivation.

The prudence and the providence of the great Catholic men of those times was signally shown in the foundation of colleges in Paris, Douai, Lisbon, Valladolid, Rome, and elsewhere, which for three centuries have returned into England a perpetual though scanty stream of educated priests. Nor have these colleges even now, in our better days, exhausted their mission. It is of great moment to the Catholic Church that its priests should practise as little as possible of the *idola specûs* of nationalism, and as much as possible of the culture of other Catholic nations; so that, even when hereafter, as we hope, the whole circle of our Catholic education is completed, there will always be an office of high importance for these colleges to discharge—namely, to contribute the culture of Spain, Portugal, Italy, and France to the culture of England in the members of our priesthood.

It would be wearisome and out of place to enter here into the details of the depression under which the Catholics of England have laboured during the last three hundred years, or to trace out the continual diminution of their numbers and the continual decrease of their strength. For a long time great numbers of the aristocracy and of the landed commonalty maintained their fidelity. In some counties of England a large

proportion of the country gentlemen and their families were Catholic. Now they form a proportion almost inappreciably small. To give an idea of the effect of penal laws, we may state what we have heard on good authority, that in Ireland, between the years 1750 and 1775, five thousand country gentlemen, with their families, apostatized from the faith. Many English families continued Catholic down to the last generation. It was the fathers or the grandfathers of many of the men of the present day who, as it is called, conformed to the Established Church. But these times of oppression were to have an end; and the religious reaction caused by the impieties of the first French Revolution came in like a spring-tide upon England and Ireland. We have little doubt that this was among the remote causes of Catholic emancipation, and of the wonderful religious phenomena which have arisen since the year 1830: such as the revival of religious earnestness, the profuse church-building throughout England and Ireland, the vast efforts for educating the people, the Anglo-Catholic movement, as it is called, of which the analysis has to yet be made, and the intellectual history to be appreciated; and, lastly, the wonderful simulations of Catholic faith, ritual, and devotion, which sprang up simultaneously and in parallel lines within the Established Church of England and the Established Church of Scotland—namely, what are called Puseyism and Irvingism. All these seem to us to be nothing more than the irregular and impetuous motions of earnest minds driven onward before the irresistible stream of ideas and sympathies which agitated the whole of Christian Europe in its recoil from unbelief and its return towards the sources of supernatural faith.

But we cannot pursue these thoughts further, tempting as they are. We must turn back to the position of the Catholic Church at the time of its emancipation. It found itself stripped of everything, incapable of holding property, of executing a legal trust, of purchasing land for its churches and schools. A few of its churches still remain, spectacles of abject and miserable poverty; such, for instance, as the old Catholic church at Brompton, near Chatham—a structure of planking for walls, with sash windows, and galleries covering half the area, steeped in and squalid with the dirt of years. Great was the faith of those who through all this degradation still beheld and adored the Divine Presence.

But the time was come for a new age to set in. In the reign of William IV. statutes were passed enabling Catholics to make legal trusts for religious and charitable purposes, to purchase land for churches and schools, and to provide endow-

ments for Divine worship and education, and for the maintenance of clergy and school-teachers. By an oversight, or by an absurd and oppressive anomaly, while the Catholic worship was legalized, the celebration of the Mass for the departed—which is a part of that worship—was still held to be a superstitious use. Nevertheless, the position was greatly ameliorated, and Catholics began to enter once more into the social and political life of England. We can remember the fear and dislike with which the first Catholic members were received in the House of Commons, and the abuse with which they were daily treated by the newspapers of this country. We can recollect also with what astonishment and aversion Mr. O'Connell was seen ascending the stairs at a *levée* at Buckingham Palace in the robes and chain of Lord Mayor of Dublin. These were portents in the State,—as when seven moons were seen at once, or when oxen spake and statues sweated blood. Nevertheless, Catholics arose and multiplied on every side. It seemed like the exuberant life of nature. Turn up the soil were you will with a spade, and the surface next the sun will spring with new forms of life. All over England Catholics manifested themselves, and churches and schools created new and visible centres of influence where the Catholic worship had never yet been seen.

Another cause which gave prominence to Catholics was the vehement endeavour of the Protestant Dissenters to reduce the status of the Established Church, by abolishing church-rates, and throwing open the Universities. The Established Church weathered the storm, and in many ways became more active and enterprising; but its traditional dignity was marred, and its exclusive superiority has ever since declined. It is now little more than the richest and most numerous among many sects. The country does not regard it as the representative and the expression of its religious convictions or of its religious affections. This again has given to the Catholic Church a new relative position in the social state of England.

Another cause, too remarkable to be passed over, is the change which took place in two of the most important of our colonies—Canada and Australia. In Canada the Catholic Church was always strong, highly respected, and possessed of great social influence. This was much increased by political changes in the colony, and by the diminution of the exclusive privileges of the Established Churches. In Australia, by the wise and equitable government of Sir Richard Bourke, the Catholic Church and the two Establishments were alike admitted, *pro rata*, to participate in the public revenues. This

has given to the Catholic Church in Australia a position and a pre-eminence which it does not possess elsewhere. We mention these two instances because they have undoubtedly reacted upon the mother country, and the stream of legislation has for these thirty years steadily set towards placing the Catholic Church in England on the same footing as in the colonies.

But all these were only preludes to an act which needed a higher hand. The Supreme Pontiff, by the Apostolical Letters, "*Universalis Ecclesia*," created in England a third epoch of its spiritual history. We are too near the great event to be fully conscious of its magnitude. They who shall be removed from it by a century will perceive its full proportions and see the outline of its results. Perhaps there has hardly been in the history of the Church a more timely and visibly providential event than the restoration of the Hierarchy at the special moment when it occurred. The whole Established Church had been in agitation on the subject of Baptism. But the excitement on this special doctrine had been merged in a deeper and more primary question respecting the authority of the Anglican Church in matters of doctrine, and the authority of the Crown as the ultimate judge of ecclesiastical appeals. Every other subject gave way to a discussion of the Royal Supremacy. The press groaned with pamphlets and protests, replies and rejoinders, upon the subject of the Supremacy of the Crown. It was boldly vindicated by the Erastian party; it was impatiently borne by the High Establishment school; it was cavilled at by some, and utterly denied by others. It was denounced by many as an usurpation upon the office of the Church, as a bondage to the civil power, as a violation of the apostolical authority of the Episcopate. Except a few thorough-going Erastians, nobody defended it. Almost everybody lamented it as an excessive claim of the Tudors, and a perpetual danger to the Church of England. Eighteen hundred Anglican clergymen joined in a public protest against it. Just at this moment, in the midst of this agitation, controversy, and awakening of reason and conscience to the true character of the Royal Supremacy, the shadow of a Divine hand fell upon men, and another supremacy was seen to assert itself in England. The English people beheld a Hierarchy of thirteen sees, under a metropolitan, a prince of the Church, rise like an exhalation from the ground, or descend as if from heaven. The calm power, majesty, and might of the Divine Supremacy of the Vicar of Jesus Christ revealed more than ever by contrast the impotence and the unlawfulness of any

human supremacy over the spiritual mission of the Church. It seemed that the very moment had been chosen which should exhibit in the strongest light this contrast of the true and the false. Then began one of the greatest religious tumults of our days. The Parliament, the municipal cities, the Universities, the counties, the Anglican bishops, the clergy of the Establishment, and we know not who besides, were all in a frenzy of excitement, protesting with one voice against Pius IX. for doing what S. Gregory I. had done before. The storm blew furiously. The Protestants threatened a re-enactment of penal laws. Some Catholics blamed everybody who had a hand in the measure, not sparing the Holy See. Croakers croaked. The wise and the prudent were oracular. The timid were frightened; some good men even were carried away by the alarm. It was said that Catholicism was put back in England by a century; that conversions were stopped; that the peaceful relations between Catholics and Protestants were broken; old antipathies revived; and all the gains since the Emancipation, and even the Emancipation itself, endangered.

Now we have always been of those who believed none of these things; but who rather believe, and that most firmly and profoundly, the direct reverse of all these things. We have ever believed that the Hierarchy was the greatest boon that the Vicar of our Lord could have bestowed upon England; that without it Catholicism would have languished; that its efforts would have wanted unity and permanence; that its productiveness would have been only partially developed; that the very gains of the Emancipation would have become dangerous to us; that if Vicars Apostolic suffice for a people under penal laws, nothing less than an ordered and perfect Hierarchy will suffice for a Catholic people restored to freedom; that from the moment of its re-establishment date both the full reorganization of the Church by the restoration of its old Catholic elements and that immense development of ecclesiastical order and spiritual fruitfulness which we now behold. All the noise, and heat, and vehemence, we regard as a cheap price for such a gift; nay, even as conducive to its confirmation. It is held by canonists that pontifical acts need only publication to oblige the conscience. The uproar published the Papal decree. The English people became the *cursores* and apparitors of the Sovereign Pontiff. They made the ears of every man to tingle with the clamorous proclamation, that the Supremacy of the Vicar of our Lord had re-asserted itself in England and claimed of all men submission to its direction. The Royal Supremacy paled before the splendour of the head of the Church of all nations upon earth.



Through all the storm of this conflict one name stands out with a clearness which almost isolated him from all others among the pastors and faithful who bore a foremost part in that great contest. A Jesuit in Rome once asked an English Catholic what he thought of the restoration of the Hierarchy in England. He answered by saying that he believed it to be a Divine providence of the most evident kind, adding that it was visibly "*digitus Dei.*" The Jesuit answered, with true Italian felicity, "*Coll' anello di Pio Nono.*" We may further add, that the hand to which the execution of the Apostolic Letters, under the seal of the Fisherman, was committed, was the hand of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. It is well known that his friends thought his life in peril; that they endeavoured to prevail on him to continue abroad, saying that his landing in England would be dangerous to him; that they advised him not to appear in the streets, and even to leave the country. And it was generally known that he refused to do any of these things; and that the firmness and calmness of his carriage not only supported the courage of other men, but chiefly prevailed to gain the signal victory which was then achieved.

For many years after this event, both in England and abroad, and even in Rome, Catholics were still found to repeat that the restoration of the Hierarchy, and the uproar which it excited, had put back Catholicism for generations; that the tide of conversion had been arrested; that the growth of all the works of the Church had been indefinitely retarded. During those years these used to be the first questions proposed by the Catholics of France on meeting their English brethren. The same representations were urged in high quarters, even in Rome itself, where the subject was made matter of formal inquiry. It is impossible for us to do more in this article than to mark in outline the true refutation of all these assertions.

And, first of all, we are at a loss to conceive how the restoration of the Hierarchy, which gives back to a mutilated part of the Church its full ecclesiastical perfection, can be an obstacle to the progress of the Catholic religion. Nor, again, how the more public and conspicuous action of the Church, by means of a Hierarchy governing with an open exercise of its prerogatives, can hinder the conversion of a people. Nor, again, how the personal influence and action of thirteen Bishops, in the government and organization of their dioceses, can fail to produce a result both on the mass of the people and on individuals, incomparably beyond the effect produced by eight Vicars Apostolic. But, in fact, the very reverse is

true. We may affirm that the great expansion of the Church dates from the restoration of the Hierarchy; that it marked the commencement of a new period, of which it was itself the instrumental cause. We can only give, in the most rapid way, a few statistics; but they will suffice.

Referring to the Catholic Directories, we find the number of churches and priests in England stated as follows:—

						Churches.	Priests.
1830	...	...	...	...	...	410	...
1840	...	...	...	...	...	457	542
1850	...	...	...	...	...	587	788
1862	...	...	...	...	...	824	1,215

To take the vicariate of London alone, we have—

						Religious Houses.	
				Churches.	Priests.	Men.	Women.
1850	...	...	104	168	2	17	

At this time the vicariate was divided into the dioceses of Westminster and Southwark. In Westminster alone we have—

						Religious Houses.	
				Churches.	Priests.	Men.	Women.
1862	...	...	80	184	12	28	

Thus the increase in Westminster alone is such that, in every particular except churches, it exceeds the return of the whole vicariate before the division. Other dioceses, such as Birmingham, Salford, and Liverpool, would no doubt present the same result; but we have not the statistics at hand.

Such is the expansion and multiplication of the Church since the restoration of the Hierarchy, as certified by statistics. But these afford only a superficial test. If we would take a more adequate measure, we must look to something more than figures. The Hierarchy engrafted the Catholic Church in England upon the Episcopate of the world; and the influx of the universal Church came into it once more with the full tide of life and vigour. The result was dioceses, cathedrals, chapters, missionary parishes. Then councils provincial and diocesan; then the provisions and traditions of the canon law, adjusted by the Holy See to the condition of our country. Then an intimate union of action and counsel with Rome, such as before had not been attainable. Every bishop in the Hierarchy became a channel of the spirit and mind of the Holy See to his diocese, with a fulness and a minuteness not possible in the vast vicariates of other days. Hence has come

an elevation and a deepening of the ecclesiastical and sacerdotal life, and an activity and a diffusion of Catholic devotion never known before.

The inevitable result of this great expansion of the Church is to multiply its wants, and to expose its members to special social dangers; and of these we will say a few words, or, at least, of the chief of them.

We will begin by briefly noting some of the principal needs of the Church in England.

First, and before all, are needed proper diocesan seminaries, according to the decrees of the Council of Trent, for the education of the priesthood. As yet such do not exist. As yet such could hardly be formed. The Vicars Apostolic of other days had done well in forming ecclesiastical colleges, in which clerical and lay students should be educated together. Out of their poverty they could do no more. And the mixture with ecclesiastical students, if less advantageous to them, was very advantageous to the lay students. But the decrees of Trent are express, and remain to be executed. They provide that to every cathedral church, and to all greater churches, such as the metropolitan, primatial, patriarchal, there shall be attached a school of tonsured clerics, of whom there is reasonable hope that they will persevere in the ecclesiastical life. They provide also, that if any diocese, by reason of poverty, be unable to maintain such a seminary, the metropolitan in the provincial council, or with two of his senior suffragans, shall take measures for the establishment of a seminary common to two or more dioceses. The metropolitan has a *conscientia onerata* to see to the execution of this decree. Until lately dioceses have not existed in England, and the decree has had no application. With the Hierarchy it began to oblige; and now we may trust that the time of its execution is come. In some of the larger of our dioceses, means will not be wanting for a lesser and a greater seminary. In the smaller dioceses, perhaps, a lesser seminary only could for a time be formed. But in all a beginning could be made; and the beginning is half the work. It may seem paradoxical to say that a seminary is even more needed in the smaller than in the larger dioceses. But it is true; for a small clergy has greater need of some centre of ecclesiastical spirit, and of the influence of example and theological help, than a large one, which possesses in itself more resources and a more vigorous life. Moreover, a seminary would certainly multiply the number of such a clergy, by inspiring a desire for the priesthood and generating vocations among the youths and even the boys of the diocese. The chief and acknowledged difficulty is the want of professors, but

these may be supplied by a little foresight; and the English College in Rome seems providentially formed to meet this want. One or two picked men from each diocese would return home in four or five years capable of making at least a sufficient beginning.

But it is not our object nor our duty to enter further into this great subject, which, as we know, has long engaged the most serious thoughts of our bishops and of other persons.

A second want is an adequate system of education for the poor and the middle classes. In the Report of the Poor School Committee of 1853, it is stated that the Catholic schools in England and Wales amount to more than 500. In the Report of the Assistant Commissioner to the Privy Council in 1861, it is stated at over 700. The number of Catholic children in England and Wales requiring education is put at 160,000. The number under education, as given by the Assistant Commissioner, is over 80,000. If in London alone there be 200,000 Catholics, there will be one-fifth between the ages of five and fifteen, or 40,000, needing education. Suppose 10,000 to be an excess, and 12,000 to be in school, as the diocesan returns show, there will be 18,000 or 20,000 Catholic children for whom, after all the efforts which have been made out of our poverty, schools have yet to be provided. To find funds sufficient for this purpose a system is needed which will not only gather or ask alms of Catholics, but so address the intellect, heart, and will of the faithful as to move them to deny themselves for the accomplishment of this great and vital work. We have a full belief that such a system of appeal, if made vigorously and maintained perseveringly, would in a generation adequately provide for our Catholic children.

Another great want is that of a higher literary and scientific education for our laymen—analogous, in fact, to that furnished by the Protestant Universities.

And this leads at once to a question of the highest importance, a solution of which must be promptly made, or it will solve itself by drifting beyond all control. It is well known that Catholics have been admitted for a long period of years to reside and study in Cambridge, but not to take degrees. Until 1854 they were absolutely excluded from Oxford. By a recent change, sanctioned by Act of Parliament, Catholics may reside and study in the colleges and halls of Oxford, and proceed to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. In Cambridge the degree of Master of Arts is also open to them. In the course of the nine years since 1854 it is said that twenty Catholics have passed through Oxford; and it is likely

that others will enter. Now two questions arise—first, whether it be expedient that Catholics should avail themselves of the liberty thus granted to them to study at the two Universities;—and, secondly, if so, whether it be expedient that they should reside as individuals within the walls of the existing colleges and halls, or that a Catholic college and hall be founded to receive them.

We will endeavour to state with the fullest force the reasons alleged on either side.

First.—It is urged that inasmuch as, by the repeal of the penal laws, Catholics are already admitted into the social life and political power of the English people, it is consequent and most advantageous that they should re-enter also into the tradition of intellectual culture and development. If they cannot regain the Universities which the Church created, at least they are no longer excluded from partaking of the benefits they confer.

Secondly.—It is undeniable that the exclusive possession of the Universities gives to the Protestant Englishman an advantage over his Catholic fellow-countryman; and that in order to cope or to compete with Protestants in public and private life, Catholics must be armed with their weapons, and share in the cultivation which constitutes their superiority.

Thirdly.—The two Universities, especially Oxford, retain in a high degree their mediæval if not Catholic character; and it is safer for Catholics to study there than in Paris, or Pisa, or other continental cities.

Fourthly.—Inasmuch as Catholics are admitted into the private and public life of England, it is of great importance that they should enter while young into relations with the men whom afterwards they must consort with in all branches of the public service, and in most of the relations of private life. The time of our exile being over, it is well that our rising generation should take their place in English society.

Fifthly.—It is certain that we can in no other way obtain the advantages of so high a culture in literature and science. The long traditional maturity and accumulated knowledge of the two Universities leave Catholics without a hope of competing with Protestants in these fields.

Sixthly.—Inasmuch as Catholics must be mixed up with Protestants in every walk and state of life, and that more and more as the religious animosities of the past are mitigated by the gradual fusion and blending of families and classes, there cannot be any special danger in their beginning early to learn how to carry themselves towards their Protestant fellow-citizens; or rather it would be far safer for them to acquire betimes such

habits of mind as will fit them for their future contact with anti-Catholic opinions and practices in after life.

Seventhly.—The question is after all hardly under control, for already many Catholics have availed themselves of the admission to Oxford and Cambridge, and many more will do so. We must accept the fact, and deal with it as best we may. Now, it is obvious that a Catholic youth, isolated in a Protestant college, without chapel, or director, or religious instruction, or the example of Catholic companions, must be less able to resist the influences of the anti-Catholic atmosphere to which he is exposed all day long from the whole system and action of the college. Place him in a hall or college founded for Catholics only, under the government of a Catholic president and fellows, with Catholic discipline and instruction, and all the helps of the spiritual life—daily mass, confession, communion, fasts and festivals—such a youth would be sustained and raised above himself, and a Catholic public opinion would be created within the walls which would resist the contagion and infection of the surrounding intellectual and moral evils. It seems evident that the establishment of such a hall is rendered necessary by facts beyond our control, be our wishes what they may.

Eighthly.—Such a hall would be an example of Catholic education and discipline which could not fail powerfully to affect the Universities, and to show by contrast that the alleged inferiority of intellectual culture is more than compensated by spiritual advantages, not only greater in degree, but of a higher order.

Lastly.—Such a hall might exercise a powerful influence in counteracting the downward tendency of our modern University education, and the development of a licence of opinion which is not only anti-Catholic but anti-Christian.

Such we believe to be a fair statement, in outline at least, of the arguments of those who are in favour of the proposal to establish Catholic halls in Oxford and Cambridge, and to complete the education of our youth in the two national Universities.

On the other hand, the reasons of those who oppose it are as follows:—

First.—They neither undervalue the importance of intellectual culture, nor overrate the present intellectual standard among the youths or the professors of our Catholic colleges; but they are of opinion that it is the mission and the duty of the Church to provide such intellectual culture within its own unity. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were creations of the Catholic Church, and what it has



created once it may create again. We are well aware that the Church in England cannot now create for itself a system of education which shall possess the traditional maturity and extension of our Universities. But "*nullum tempus ecclesiæ occurrit.*" We may begin in this day as they first began who came to the schools of S. Frideswide. The Church of the first ages used the schools of Athens and Alexandria so long as it had none of its own. But the first moment it could form true Christian and Catholic schools, the Church withdrew its sons from all contact with an anti-Catholic or even an un-Catholic teaching.

Secondly.—They are of opinion that the anti-Catholic atmosphere of Oxford and Cambridge cannot fail to be secretly and deeply injurious to the faith and morals of the Catholic students. It is a known fact, that of the Catholics who have studied at Trinity College, Dublin, few have escaped without more or less of injury, not only to piety but to faith. And yet the Catholic student there has the advantage of living in one of the most energetically Catholic cities in the world, and of possessing in abundance all the means of his own sanctification and perseverance. They have the best evidence for knowing that Catholics have lost their faith in Trinity College. Hundreds, it is said, could be easily counted up—two of them a dean and a bishop in the Irish Establishment. And even those who do not lose their faith are generally but little attached to their religion, and do not regularly frequent the sacraments. A Catholic bishop who studied there has been heard to say that his preservation from perdition amidst so many dangers, was as great a miracle as the preservation of Daniel in the lions' den. The same prelate is always anxious to keep young men from Trinity College. Such is known to be the judgment of the highest ecclesiastical authorities in Ireland.

If such has been the effect of Trinity College upon those who had every help to resist it, what would be the effect of Oxford and Cambridge upon the handful of Catholics who might study there? Hardly is there to be found any atmosphere more powerful to transform and to assimilate those who live in it to its own properties. What takes place in Dublin, with almost every check to counteract it, may be reasonably predicted of Oxford and Cambridge, where everything is intensely anti-Catholic, and the anti-Catholic spirit dominant and, in a manner, irresistible.

Thirdly.—They believe that even the discipline and spirit of a Catholic hall would not suffice against the powerful allurements and subtle fascinations, intellectual and worldly, of our

English Universities. It is not intended that the members of a Catholic hall, at Oxford or at Cambridge, should live as hermits, or as exiles from academic society. The making of friendships, and the entering into relations with Protestants who will be their companions or colleagues in after life, is part of the argument in favour of such a system. They who oppose this view believe that such contact and society, which in our Universities is very free and irresponsible, would be most dangerous to those who as yet are immature in mind and character. They think that there is evidence enough of the injurious effects of English Protestant society upon the Catholics who court it or live much in it. They believe that the fidelity of Catholics showed more brightly a generation ago through the darkness of the penal laws and of social exile, than now when the sun shines upon them. They are not anxious, therefore, to see the rising Catholic youth brought under those influences, which dazzle and unman their elders, at an age when they are least able to discern and to resist them. They believe that a thorough and hardy training in Catholic faith and morality, and in science and literature read in their light, with the practices and instincts of Catholic devotion, is a better preparation for the conflict which awaits them in the world, and the only safeguard against its fascinations. They would rather see them trained and cultivated by a higher literary and scientific discipline, from the age of eighteen to twenty-two, at Oscott or Ushaw, than see Oscott or Ushaw transferred to Oxford and Cambridge. They believe that Oscott and Ushaw transferred to Oxford and Cambridge would become more or less acclimatized, and that they would lose their high Catholic spirit, and power to mould the character of their youths.

Fourthly.—They believe that the whole argument, so elaborately and eloquently developed by Dr. Newman, in his Lectures on University Education, applies with direct force to this subject. They believe that not only would all history and philosophy be anti-Catholic as delivered from the chairs of Anglican professors, but that it would not be worthy of the name of history or philosophy if withdrawn from the light and guidance of Catholic theology. Whatsoever, then, be the lectures delivered within the walls of the Catholic hall, the teaching of the University and the examinations of the University, which in the end determine the course of study, would inevitably penetrate into the college, and prevail over any individual teacher. Count de Maistre said that history since the Reformation has been in conspiracy against the Catholic Church. We may say that philosophy, since

Descartes, has to a wider extent than is suspected joined in the conspiracy. And yet these are essentially the history and philosophy delivered at the English Universities.

Fifthly.—They cannot find any ground for the sanguine hope that a Catholic hall would teach the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge how to live, or leaven the life and spirit of the Universities. When they see what is the action and power of the whole Hierarchy and priesthood, with all its ecclesiastical organization, aided by the examples of the faithful, upon English society at large, they have little reason to believe that a Catholic hall will do the work of an evangelist in Oxford and Cambridge. The Church acts as a solid and compact body upon the loose and dissolving classes of English society; and yet, though in one sense how great, in another how little, is the impression it makes. But the intellectual and spiritual antagonism at the Universities is compact, disciplined, and tenacious to the highest conceivable degree. The shadow of Peter might, indeed, work a miracle upon it. But there is little reason to believe that the shadow of Peter would be cast by a Catholic hall. They are not without fear that the effect might be diametrically the reverse. Much more would be expected of a Catholic hall than, perhaps, any institution could fulfil; and one Catholic scandal would undo the influence of ten Catholic examples of good.

Sixthly.—They are of opinion that the power the Catholic Church exercises over the people of England comes precisely from the fact that it is separate from it, not mingled with it or dependent upon it. They are ready to believe that a Catholic University in England would powerfully affect both Oxford and Cambridge by its more perfect order and discipline; and that men who desire the welfare of their sons would be strongly attracted to a university of which Ushaw and Oscott may be taken as the preludes. They are the living witnesses of what mediæval Oxford and Cambridge were. And we know that even Protestants who are anxious to save their sons from the squandering and vice of our Universities, have of late years contemplated the sending them to a Catholic college.

Seventhly.—They believe that the risk to a number of individuals is not to be weighed against the danger of committing the Church to a false position. Much as we must deplore that any should be exposed to the occasion of losing either faith or piety, still even this must be endured rather than implicate the Church in relations which involve false principles; for the loss of individuals is an evil to be measured, but the admission of a false principle is a fountain of evils of which no measure can be conceived. It would be a sad but safer alternative to

endure the loss of any number of individuals than to place the Church in the condition it occupies in the universities of Germany. Syncretism has borne, and will bear, its bitter fruits there as a warning to us.

Eighthly.—The founding of such a hall would be a public and authoritative sanction, and even invitation, to Catholics to send their sons to Protestant universities. The Church itself would be giving the impulse in that direction.

Ninthly.—Such a course would indefinitely postpone all efforts towards founding purely Catholic colleges for higher lay education; a work absolutely needed already, and becoming every day more urgently and vitally necessary as the Catholic Church expands its own system, and multiplies its members, among the middle and higher classes.

Tenthly.—They submit that the question of founding a hall in the Anglican Universities, so as to participate in a common secular education, reserving the particular religious instruction, is no longer open. It seems rather to involve a concession of the whole principle for which we have been so long and so earnestly contending. This alleged separateness of secular and religious teaching was the basis of Mr. Stanley's Irish education scheme, against which the Catholic Church in Ireland so firmly opposed itself; and from which, under the sanction of the Holy See, it is now extricating itself. This also is the basis of the Godless Colleges, which the Holy See has declared to be "*intrinsecè periculosa*," and to which the Synod of Thurles warns the faithful not to send their sons. It forbids also any priest to teach in them. This also was the motive for founding the Catholic University so expressly approved by Rome, and so cherished by the episcopate and people of Ireland. This, again, is the scheme of secular and general education which, when proposed by the Government, caused the great educational movement of the last five-and-twenty years. Against this it was that the Catholics of England also protested, and from which they so jealously and successfully protected themselves by the agreement embodied in the Minutes of the Privy Council in 1847. It would seem, therefore, to be a departure from the whole of our past conduct, and a giving up of the principles for which we have so strongly contended. How shall we refuse a common secular education for our poor children if we court and catch at it for the children of the rich?

Eleventhly.—It would seem also that this is the worst moment for making such a compromise. If it was permissible for the Catholics in Ireland to submit to the National Education Board, and to avail themselves of the only education possible

to them by reason of their poverty, certainly the rich families of England can find no such excuse for seeking admission to our Protestant Universities. They have abundant means of educating their children; and if the standard of intellectual cultivation in our Catholic colleges be not so high as at Oxford and Cambridge, no amount of intellectual culture or social advantage can be weighed in the scale against the least measure of fidelity to the Catholic faith and Catholic morality. It is to be always remembered that the Irish national education, if it was un-Catholic, was at least not anti-Catholic. If it was deprived of positive Catholic teaching and influence, it was not guided nor impelled by an anti-Catholic spirit. But with our Universities this is not so. They are formally, essentially, traditionally, and, so far as any influence Catholics can exert upon them, immutably anti-Catholic. The English schism and the Protestant heresy have penetrated to the bone, and poisoned the life-blood of Oxford and Cambridge, the great schools of Anglicanism,—which they will never cease to be except by exchanging the partial Rationalism of the Reformation, for that fuller Rationalism which is its legitimate development. And this greatly strengthens their argument, and confirms their opposition to such a scheme of united education for Catholics and Protestants. They would have objected to the sending of our Catholic youths to Oxford and Cambridge at any period, since the Reformation, when the Universities were at their highest point of Christian belief, while as yet the inspiration and integrity of Holy Scripture were held sacred, and Rationalism had as yet found no formal entrance into them. How much more, then, at the time when the modern spirit of cultivated unbelief, in the form of criticism and philosophy, has not only entered but established itself, so as to be the predominant intellectual tendency of the more studious members of the Universities. The Protestant Bishops of Winchester and London have confessed what Dr. Colenso has repeated,—that the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge are turning away from Anglican orders. The *Times* may try to persuade men that this is because the clergy are underpaid. They who are acquainted with the Universities and public opinion, know that the true reason is an intellectual departure from the traditional Christianity of England. And is it at such a moment as this that Catholics will forsake the strongholds which have protected them these three hundred years, to venture into the midst of the occasions of unbelief presented by the Rationalism which gains head day by day? The Catholic Church in Ireland no sooner begins to feel its freedom, and with freedom the return of strength, than it begins at once to liberate itself

from the un-Catholic system of national education. It is no time, therefore, for the Catholics in England to make a step so retrograde, and so utterly at variance with the whole march and extension of the Catholic Church in this country. We have already noticed the wonderful unfolding of the Church—how the Catholics who lay scattered and hid in the millions of the English people have been drawn and knit together by the Hierarchy into a visible body, which every year increases in bulk and vigour and fruitfulness. The Church is reproducing its past with an exuberance of life and a precision of action which leaves us nothing to desire but patience, and fidelity to the immutable principles and the supernatural instincts of the faith. If in the times of their poverty the Vicars Apostolic could found and raise three such colleges as Old Hall, Oscott, and Ushaw, why should not the united Catholic Hierarchy of England found a University? They did it when Catholics were few, scattered, and poor in the extreme. We live in days when Catholics are numerous, united, and conscious of their union, and, if not rich, yet possessed of wealth as compared with the poverty of the past. If the Catholics of the penal laws could do such things, why should not the free Catholics of to-day do greater things, if only they have the zeal, the fidelity, the high Catholic instincts, and the unbending integrity of Catholic principle, which, as we have said, were luxuriant in our darker days. God forbid that these virtues should droop and fade in our days of peace!

Twelfthly.—Nor is it to be thought that the founding of a Catholic University in England is a dream of Utopia. A body which has in one day founded thirteen dioceses and developed them as we have shown above, need shrink from no enterprise. It possesses already all the elements of a University. Its eight lesser colleges of Sedgley Park, Mount S. Mary's, S. Edward's, Downside, Ratchiffe, S. Beuno's, Beaumont Lodge, Ampleforth, and its four greater colleges of Stonyhurst, Oscott, Old Hall, and Ushaw, naturally lead up to and demand a University for their completion, as an arch demands its keystone. Neither is there lack of materials for such a work. The Church of all nations can draw upon the nationality of all nations for its institutions. The Society of Jesus alone contains in itself men capable of holding professors' chairs in all the chief faculties of arts, literature, and science. For classical literature and Oriental languages, Germany is open to us; for theology, Italy; for science, history, modern languages, and literature, all Catholic nations; for if Protestantism possesses the culture of England, the culture of other nations is Catholic. The founding of a Catholic University in Eng-



land is therefore a thing not only to be desired, but to be achieved with no greater difficulty than besets all great enterprises; and all the enterprises of the Catholic Church are great, and none are difficult, because it is the Church which for eighteen hundred years has accomplished greater works in a power above its own.

But here we must leave this subject. We have done no more than enumerate the arguments *per summa capita*, reserving to ourselves, if need be, a fuller and more adequate treatment of it.

Another want is greater practical efficiency and more public usefulness in our laymen. The social exile in which they have lived, and their exclusion, if not by statute, yet by traditional prejudice, from public and even private employments, have seriously diminished their capacities of usefulness. No English Catholic has any chance of being returned by an English constituency. The only Catholic member for an English seat is returned by the legitimate influence of a Catholic family. But in time this evil would correct itself, if in our larger towns Catholics were found with capacities for public business—we will not say up to the measure of the late Frederick Lucas, but the same in kind—we mean manly good sense, with a thorough mastery of their subject. If among the Catholic members there were men who would thoroughly study, each one branch of the public service—finance, poor-law, colonies, trade in its details, and the like—they would certainly command the ear of the House at all times, and where any subject of the Catholic Church were concerned would be listened to with respect. The English people are easily conciliated by any public usefulness, or power of beneficence. We have often heard it said, and we think truly, that our chief *man* of public business, after the late Mr. Lucas, was Mrs. Chisholm. In her charitable schemes for promoting emigration, she received the support and co-operation of the most unlikely persons, of all political and religious parties, who, seeing her great usefulness, made no question of her religion.

The only other want we will notice is that hitherto the Catholic Church of England has no organ or provision whatever for foreign missions. It may be said that England is itself a missionary country, and could hardly be expected to undertake missions to other lands, or to give to others what it hardly possesses itself. But this does not seem to us to be true. England is a special debtor to the world—first to its own colonies, next to the nations and races which are opened to it by its commerce. It would be a shame and a rebuke to us if, while Protestant England acknowledges this duty, and sends its missionaries

abroad at the cost of nearly half a million a-year, Catholic England should do nothing. Such was not the temper of the faithful who lived under the heathen empire of Rome. They regarded the world-wide structure of its power, with all the activity of its material life, as the means and conditions by which they might traverse its vast circuit, and bear the light of salvation to the most distant races of mankind. The time is come for us to recognize this duty—we may say this providential call; and in obeying it we shall obtain great and specific blessings. It is well known that no congregation in France obtains more or better vocations than the *Congrégation des Missions Etrangères*. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church; and the *Salle des Martyrs* inspires vocations in the generous youth of France. So it would be with England. We believe that a College of Foreign Missions, worthily directed, would elevate the ecclesiastical spirit and multiply vocations even for the Church at home. But we can but touch by the way a question which demands a direct and ample treatment.

So much in few words of our chief wants; of those at least which we think it within our province to notice. It may be well, perhaps, to add also a few on our dangers.

One copious and manifold source of danger is the anti-Catholic atmosphere—the Germans would call it the time-spirit,—or the dominant current of thought and action which pervades the age and society in which we are born. No one wholly escapes its influence; most are deeply penetrated with it. We doubt whether it was so dangerous to Catholics before the Emancipation as it is now. In those days the direct action of persecuting laws ground down or bore down the courage of multitudes. But the allurements of English society and English public opinion had little power. They were hostile, harassing, and repulsive. Now they are far more perilous; being bland, insidious, and seducing. Public opinion is Protestant; and Protestantism is formally opposed to the idea of a Church divinely constituted and endowed. The first principles and maxims of Catholic education—such as submission to a teaching authority, fear of error, mistrust of our own judgments—are extinct. This spirit begins in our schools, pervades our Universities, and animates the whole of English society. We cannot draw breath without inhaling it; and the effect of it is visible upon men who do not suspect themselves of any want of Catholic instincts. It has become unconscious; and what strikes and offends foreign Catholics, is hardly, or not at all, perceived by those who are born into this atmosphere.

Another serious danger, which might also have been treated as a want, proceeds from the absence of a Catholic literature. As we have said, the culture of the English people passed into the hands of the men of the Reformation, leaving the Catholic remnant stripped of everything. The first race of Catholics, such as Stapleton and Harding, had received their cultivation before the schism. Many of those who immediately succeeded, such as Parsons and Baker, had been educated in the Universities. With them the English Catholic literature ceased until the reign of James II. At that time a few controversial octavos without name of the author, and printed either abroad or at the private printing-press in Oxford, were published; but a literature—that is, works on history, biography, science physical and moral, or of general information, poetry or fiction—by Catholic hands, has never existed. The Catholics of England have been compelled either to read foreign Catholic works, which are accessible only to a few, or the books of anti-Catholic writers, or, as with the great majority, to be deprived of the wholesome culture and information on which the development of the intelligence depends. We can never forget the passage in Lord Macaulay's "History of England,"\* in which he indulges in a misplaced satire upon the English written by Catholics in the time of James II. It was assuredly bad enough. Those days are happily past, and Catholics can speak and write their mother English with no inferiority to their anti-Catholic fellow-countrymen. Nevertheless a Catholic literature is yet to be formed; and its non-existence entails on our youth disadvantages, the extent and perilous character of which it is difficult to estimate.

But a still graver danger seems to us to be one which many least suspect. We are less afraid of any evils *ab extra*, howsoever grave or imminent, than of any evil, howsoever light it may appear, which penetrates the interior spirit of what we may call the Catholic society of England. We have said once and again that the old days of storm were rough, but safer for us. We have much more fear of the sunshine. When Xenophon's soldiers beheld the sea, they fell on their knees and worshipped. When Linnæus first saw the common furze in full bloom, we are told that he knelt down and bared his head. Whether these ecstasies be historical or no, we will not stop to enquire; but they illustrate the fascination of things long hoped for, found at last, and the proneness of man to pay a superstitious adoration, like the Athenians, to the unknown God. We should

---

\* Vol. ii. pp. 110, 111.

be gravely alarmed if there appeared, among other signs of the times, a world-worship among Catholics; and above all if that world were the English world, which has only just begun to tolerate the faith and the persons of Catholics. The polity of England as it exists in statutes is indeed changed, but the policy of Governments lags behind the letter of the law. The anti-Catholic spirit of English society controls the public administration, from the patronage of the Crown to the votes of the parish vestry. So likewise in what is called "society," that is, in the customs and intercourse of the richer families of the higher and middle classes. In the last thirty years, Catholics have penetrated into this sanctuary, as adventurous travellers into S. Sophia. Too often we fear they have put off their shoes upon the threshold; and even, like our adventurous Captain Burton at Mecca, have entered as sound Mahomedans. Now it seems to us that any gratuitous conformity on the part of Catholics to the rubrics of worldliness, and still more any simulation of the tone of an un-Catholic society, even by the concealment of their own faith, much more by their wearing the vestments of another religion, would be not only an infidelity towards God, but what some people may think much worse—a signal imprudence towards the world they desire to propitiate by their worship. English society, with all its vices, does, after all, represent the English character. There is something downright, manly, and decided in it; and it respects the same—that is, its own—qualities in others as much as it despises and ridicules all servile or petty eagerness to court its favour. Downright, manly, and decided Catholics—more Roman than Rome, and more ultramontane than the Pope himself—may enter English society and be treated with goodwill and respect everywhere, if only they hold their own with self-respect and a delicate consideration of what is due to others. It is this very boldness which inspires both respect and confidence. It is the pledge of sincerity, and sincerity is respected by everybody worthy of the name of Englishman. No greater blunder could be committed than to try to propitiate Englishmen or English society by a tame, diluted, timid, or worldly Catholicism.

But it is not our purpose to write a homily, and our pages warn us to draw to an end. A few words, and no more, we may add on the remedies we need. Philosophers divide forces into mechanical and dynamical; and we would say that what we need is not so much in the mechanical order as in that of the interior forces of will and character, both natural and supernatural. We have great works to do, and at first sight little material out of which to create them. But it is His work

who chooses "things that are not, that He may bring to nought the things that are." And it is the paradox and the glory of the Church, as verified in its history, to do the greatest works with the slenderest means. At every turn we are met by the same objection. At the commencement of every great work we are asked, But where are the men, and where is the money? It is not in impatience, but in pure conviction, we would answer: Vigour creates men and coins money. If we had only vigour, as our Lord said of faith, all things in His service would be easy to us. We are in an age of enterprise, and are busied with all manner of schemes for works of piety and charity. Even our amusements have taken a pious turn. We have concerts, theatricals, balls, excursions, and the like, for religious ends. The world itself, it seems, is becoming pious. "All things to me are lawful." But this is only on the surface. We have a deeper service of the Spirit to learn and to practise; a mightier power is needed wherewith to achieve the important works we have to do. Amphion built cities, but concerts will not remove mountains; and the Church in England has mountains in its path. We do not wish to disquiet the conscience of anyone taking a harmless interest in innocent things; but there is a harder service yet to be done, and when begun, these softer things will go over the horizon as the thistle-down is blown away from a field of battle. There is a sharper note in the trumpet which gives no uncertain sound; and it is calling us to higher paths than to Willis's Rooms. Catholics have taught the world to build and endow churches, colleges, monasteries—out of their own sole inheritance, for the love of Jesus and of the souls for whom He died. Catholics have taught the world to sell all and follow Christ: that His words are to be taken to the letter now as in the beginning; in England as in Palestine. Catholics have taught the world the law of almsgiving—that it ought to be proportionate, and not out of superfluity, or of that which costs us nothing. And we are bound to bear our witness that the world has in some degree profited by the lesson. Noble examples in the last twenty years have been and are among our brethren of the separation. And we pray God to bless their generosity with the reward of a perfect faith. But they who have done these noble deeds have not done them by the above-named means. They have not learned these means of us. We rather have learned them of the world, against which it behoved us always to bear witness to the highest wisdom and the highest good, which not only condemns evil, but gently discountenances the innocent but less expedient ways of serving our Master. Let every one enjoy his Christian liberty. But do not let us

mistake the soft and the easy ways of charity for the spirit of the Church. In us it would be a degeneracy which would justly bring down upon us the rebuke deserved by the modern Greeks:—

Ye have the Pyrrhic dance as yet :  
Where is the Pyrrhic phalanx gone ?  
Of two such lessons why forget  
The nobler and the manlier one ?

And here we would leave the matter. We have an unlimited confidence in the charity which first measures the work to be done in the light of the Blessed Sacrament, and then its own means of doing it with crucifix in hand; and in the doing conceal itself so that the left hand knows not what the right hand doeth. On this we rely, and to this we appeal, leaving all other forms of modern charity to drop off as the toys and gauds of infancy. "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away the things of a child."\*

And now, to sum up all we have said of our dangers, we would repeat that what we most fear is that Catholics may cast themselves willingly, or be drawn unconsciously, into the stream which is evidently carrying English society every year more and more decidedly and perceptibly towards worldliness and Rationalism. The growth of worldliness in every form, the appearance of moral evils in our domestic life, the breaking down of the barriers which guarded the last generation; the lower, laxer, freer habits, not only of men but of women, not only of mature age but of the young, both before and after marriage; the growth and multiplication of forms of social corruption never known before, or, at least, never so systematically practised and so habitually connived at; the abdication of authority by parents, and the derision of authority by children;—all these and many more signs are abroad to warn us that a dangerous future is before us, and to awaken Catholics to a redoubled vigilance over themselves and their children, and a greater fidelity to the Church which, with a gentle austerity, restrains them from many points of contact with the anti-Catholic society of England. If any one desire a signal example of our meaning, let him read an article in the *Saturday Review* of July 4, misnamed, we think, by an unseasonable jocularity, "Frisky Matrons." We see nothing to laugh at in an evil which, like the head-disease called the *plica polonica*,

---

\* 1 Cor. xiii. 11.



seems light and superficial, but really eats into the blood and bone. This is not the atmosphere to which we desire our Catholic women to be acclimatized, or in which we wish their daughters to be reared. The readers of the *Times* will not need us to remind them of the articles on "Pretty Horse-breakers," and on the growing infrequency of marriage among the young men of the higher classes of society. But we will not pursue these subjects further. This is not the atmosphere in which the Catholics of the penal laws would have desired to immerse their sons and daughters; and we trust that the Catholics of this day will be faithful to the high moral discernment and traditions of their fathers.

As to the other danger which lies before us, from the development of Rationalism, it is impossible to do more than make a passing allusion to it. We are firmly convinced that in twenty years Rationalism will inundate England. In every century since the Reformation England has sunk lower and lower in formal rejection of revealed doctrine. It has passed through the two phases which have appeared in Germany, and it is entering upon the third. The period of Protestant dogmatism has given place to Protestant pietism, and this is now passing off into Protestant Rationalism,—the prelude of Philosophical Rationalism in the educated, and rude unbelief in the people. The school of Hooker, Andrews, and Laud numbers now but a handful of the population. It is an esoteric literature, not a living power. The school of Cecil, Venn, and Simeon has issued in a multitude of dissolving forms of opinion. The school of rationalistic Christianity is numerous and growing, and possesses many high places of trust and influence. Dr. Colenso is a fair sample of the actual and dominant tendency of religious belief among us. There can be little question that, if the majority of the Anglican clergy be against him, the vast majority of the Anglican laity would be with him. His common-sense scepticism is the true Anglican layman's faith. And we cannot doubt that every year this unbelief will more widely spread, and that the two Universities will be thoroughly pervaded by it. Instead, therefore, of implicating ourselves in a sinking wreck, it is the prudence of common sense, as well as the obligation of Catholic duty, to keep ourselves free, not only from all entanglements with it, but as far as possible from the vortex which it makes in going down. We earnestly hope that Catholics, while they manifest to their fellow-countrymen the largest social charity and the truest public fidelity, will keep themselves from all contact with the traditions of anti-Catholic policy and education. We repeat again, that an education deprived of the light of faith and the guidance

of the Church, is essentially anti-Catholic. Here there can be no neutrality: "He that is not for Me is against Me." There is but one safety for us: "Sentire cum Ecclesiâ," in the whole extent of faith, discipline, worship, customs, and instincts—the most intimate and filial fidelity of intellect, heart, and will to the living voice of the Church of God.

---

## Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.

---

THIS department is intended to include papers on various subjects of interest which admit of more or less latitude of opinion among Catholics, and in the treatment of which it appears desirable that fuller scope should be given to individuality whether of thought or expression than is consistent with the corporate character of a Review.

In regard to all such papers we are simply responsible for the judgment that they contain nothing which a good Catholic is not at liberty to hold; and that their publication is expedient and beneficial.

Occasional papers on subjects which may be more gracefully and graphically treated where the writer is able to speak more directly in his own proper person, will also find their appropriate place in this department of our REVIEW.

A specimen of such a subject, so treated, we are enabled to present to our readers in the following paper, the first of a series of four, read by Canon Oakeley before the English Academy of the Catholic Religion, at the end of the last and the beginning of the present year. The remaining three will appear successively in our future numbers.

We may possibly be biassed in our judgment by personal associations, but we certainly think that the Tractarian movement, to which these papers refer, possessed a very special character of its own, and is well worthy the study of any thoughtful Catholic. Among other peculiarities, it has this remarkable one,—it was assuredly a movement tending from heresy towards Catholicism: the event in so many individual instances indicates this; and we think that no intelligent Catholic acquainted with the phenomena will doubt it. And yet the *human* influences under which it advanced were not on the whole Catholic influences acting from without, but internal influences pressing the agents blindly forward.

On the other hand, the movement in question was radically and fundamentally dissimilar to any which had previously existed in the Establishment since the schism of the 16th century. Whatever may have been its superficial resemblance, or its historical relation, to the Laudian and Non-juring reactions respectively, it really stood over against them in the

broadest contrast; differing from them simply as a reality differs from a sham. In may be asked how we are to account for this indubitable contrast:—why it is that Tractarianism was so fertile in those practical results, which were conspicuously absent in the earlier movements. And our belief is, that there is one cause for this so predominant that no other is worthy of mention: we mean the personal gifts and personal influence of Mr. Newman. We designate him by his pre-Catholic name, as we are speaking of his pre-Catholic career; and we believe that in proportion as any Catholic is cognizant of the circumstances, he will acquit us of exaggeration in what we have just said. A protest, indeed, may imaginably be made in Mr. Froude's behalf, of whom Canon Oakeley gives so touching and life-like a picture in the following paper, and who, it is generally believed, was mainly instrumental in converting Mr. Newman to Tractarian ideas. That Mr. Froude's character exhibits traits of most unusual humility, self-government, unworldliness, and energy, it would, we think, be impossible to deny. Nor can it be doubted that these noble qualities enabled him to see through many fallacies which imposed on others, and to recognize many great truths of which his contemporaries little dreamed. Still many might fail to see in his writings those rare intellectual excellences ascribed to him by his friends; while there appear to be strong reasons for believing that, had the movement been under his guidance, it would have been barren of all important practical issue.

Such questions as these, however, appertain to what may be called a philosophical history of Tractarianism; and it will be long before the period has arrived for successfully attempting such a history. Canon Oakeley rather aims at a graphic and pictorial exhibition of the *facts*, than at a careful analysis of the various principles and influences which were at work; and his papers also have a peculiar value from containing his personal reminiscences of events, "*quorum*," it may truly be said, "*pars magna fuit*." His undertaking appears to us peculiarly well-timed; for it is necessary that we should first obtain the widest possible knowledge of facts, if we would philosophize to any purpose. Those of our readers who may have themselves once been Tractarians, will be interested in the revival of many remembrances almost extinct; and some, we hope, of those who have had no personal connection with the movement, may not be displeased at obtaining further knowledge of its details. The freshness and vividness of description; the geniality and kindness of tone; the many personal references and allusions;—all combine in giving a

peculiar charm to the following narrative. And to one particular we would specially advert; viz., the author's treatment of theological opponents. Without the least compromise of his own loyalty to the one sovereign and exclusive Truth, he is full of consideration and tenderness towards those who, unhappily for themselves, have failed to attain it.

It may be worth while to make one final remark on a matter to which Canon Oakeley has not referred. Some fifteen years ago there was (not unnaturally) considerable fear with many, lest those who had entered the Church by the Tractarian road should form a kind of clique or party, acting in concert together, and standing aloof from other Catholics. Of course it cannot be denied that there is a certain family likeness among those nurtured in Tractarianism, from the great similarity of influences to which they have been subjected. But it is somewhat remarkable that, among all the various divisions of action and opinion which exist among English Catholics, there is none which can be characterized as a convert party; while there is perhaps not one which does not number among its adherents various *çi-devant* Tractarians.

---

## HISTORICAL NOTES OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.\*

### PART I.—*From the Beginning of the Movement to the Publication of Tract 90 (exclusive).*

WITH the view of helping to keep alive the memory of an important crisis in the ecclesiastical annals of this country, the contemporary witnesses to which will soon have passed away, I purpose, not to write a history, but to set down certain notes or memoranda of the great religious movement which took its rise in the University of Oxford about thirty years ago. My record shall be founded upon reminiscences of my own, aided by those of others, and by published writings of the period. Though my own connection with the movement was far less intimate than that of many who are still living, and though my own name will never pass with theirs to future generations as one of its leaders or of its luminaries; yet for these very reasons I am, in one point of view, perhaps, and in one only, better qualified to bear testimony to it than those who took a more active and prominent part in it; inasmuch as my position in reference to it was more external; as I am not embarrassed by the restraints which personal humility or the obligations of mutual confidence might impose upon them; and as the public may reasonably consider such a witness to make up in independence what he wants in other claims upon its regard. The words with which the great Historian of the Peloponnesian War introduces his work are so literally applicable to my own humble task, that I am not deterred from quoting them by the almost ludicrous dissimilarity of the two undertakings, which, for a moment, they bring into juxta-position. "The transactions of the contest," he says,

---

\* It may be proper to observe that the form of this paper, as of those that will follow, has been somewhat changed, so as to adapt them to the place which the editor of this REVIEW has kindly provided for them in the department of "Essays and Miscellaneous Papers;" yet not so entirely as to remove from some of them, at least, the familiar and colloquial character which suited their original, better than it suits their present, destination.—F. O.



"which I have thought it right to record, are neither related upon hearsay evidence, nor according to the bias of my own opinions; but are such, either as I myself bore personal part in, or as have been reported to me by others, according to the best means of accuracy at my command. Yet is my task not without its difficulties; considering how dependent are our actual impressions upon the caprices of memory, and the vicissitudes of feeling, and that at last our record may be distasteful to many critics just in proportion as it substitutes the true for the fabulous."\*

It is no small evidence in favour of the great religious movement in question that we should find so much difficulty in assigning to it a name which is not either unjust towards its real character, or inadequate to its extent and importance. We have no such difficulty about the nomenclature of a heresy or a party agitation; we call the one by the name of the heresiarch, the other by that of the demagogue or popular idol; and such terms, with due allowance for the imperfection of all general appellatives, are sufficient to cover the ground of the idea they represent without going beyond it. But who shall include within the limits of a brief definition, still less express by the force of a simple term, a religious manifestation which was the result of a simultaneous yet mutually independent stirring of hearts in various places about the same time, rather than of any pre-meditated design and concerted action; whose elements of vitality seemed to float in the air rather than to be confined within the range of a single spot; which its enemies delighted to characterize as an "epidemic"—a phrase which its friends were not unwilling to accept, in so far as it implied that their work was not so much propagated by contact as due to unseen agencies which human analysis was unable to investigate, and subject to laws which human power was too weak to oppose? Shall we call it by a name which degrades it to the level of a sect, and identifies it in some exclusive or especial way with an amiable and esteemed divine who, after all, was neither its author nor the most prominent of its leaders? No; for that were to commit an historical error, as well as a controversial discourtesy. Or shall we call it by the name of the University which, if not its home, was at least its head-quarters? That were indeed far truer to facts and free from the vice of personality. Yet, should we call it the Oxford revival, what would Cambridge say which had its share in the work, or London

---

\* Thucyd. lib. i. cap. 22.

which helped it on, or Oscott which smiled upon it? Nay, what would Oxford herself say, that famous university, which, so far from claiming its authors as her own, regarded them as a knot of pestilential agitators; scowled upon them, denounced them, degraded them, and at length drove them from her bosom? Or, lastly, shall we call it the Catholic movement of the Anglican Establishment? But that were to encumber our definition itself with a new controversy, or at least to involve it in a *petitio principii*. On the whole, I am disposed to rest in the modest term, Tractarian; not as being free from material objections, but as being, at any rate, unpretending, uninvincible, and sufficient for the purpose. For the "Tracts for the Times" certainly contained, one with another, the principles of which the movement, in its ultimate state, was the legitimate development, although some of those who were their authors withdrew from it as it advanced, and even ranged themselves on the side of its enemies.

The theory of party combination by which the opponents of the Tractarian school always endeavoured to weaken its importance, was, from the first, strenuously resisted by its friends, as will be evident to any one who reads, even cursorily, the publications to which it gave rise. That theory was, in fact, the world's usual apology for its own ignorance; an attempt to explain facts which were strange to it upon principles with which it is conversant. But a sufficient answer to the charge of astute complicity is to be found, not merely in the singlemindedness of the principal movers, but in the remarkable differences of character and personal antecedents which distinguished them one from another; differences which they sought neither to conceal by diplomacy, nor to reconcile by compromise. Mr. Newman was unlike both Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble, who were, in their turn, unlike one another; and Mr. Froude, whom Dr. Newman somewhere calls the real author of the movement, had nothing originally in common either with Mr. Newman or Dr. Pusey, except the great abilities which he shared with the former, and the loyalty to the Anglican communion which was common to all.

Between Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble there had once existed a state of feeling which was far from being one of religious sympathy; and Mr. Froude speaks of it as a bright feature in his life that he had been instrumental in bringing these two remarkable men together. The two of these leaders who most resembled one another in personal characteristics were Mr. Keble and Mr. Froude. Both of them sons of High Church clergymen, and, so far, differing at once from Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, they had imbibed from their earliest years an

affectionate attachment to their Church's system, which became a powerful bond of union when they were brought together as members of the same college at Oxford, although their respective educations had been different, and Mr. Keble was considerably Mr. Froude's senior. The only one of these remarkable men who has passed into the region of history is he who, though the youngest of the whole number in years, deserves to be commemorated as the first who took a comprehensive view of the character and bearings of the movement. Mr. Froude was a college contemporary of my own, and I enjoyed at one time the privilege of constant intercourse and familiar acquaintance with him. Those who have formed their impression of him from his published "Remains" will scarcely, perhaps, be prepared to hear how little there appeared in his external deportment, while he was at Oxford, of that remarkable austerity of life which he is now known to have habitually practised even then. To a form of singular elegance, and a countenance of that peculiar and highest kind of beauty which flows from purity of heart and mind, he added manners the most refined and engaging. That air of sunny cheerfulness which is best expressed by the French word *riant*, never forsook him at the time when I knew him best, and diffused itself, as is its wont, over every circle in which he moved. I have seen him in spheres so different as the common-rooms of Oxford and the after-dinner company of the high aristocratic society of the West of England; and I well remember how he mingled even with the last in a way so easy yet so dignified as at once to conciliate its sympathies and direct its tone. He was one of the few who seemed to have extracted good out of an English public-school education, while uninfected by its manifold vices. Popular among his companions from his skill in all athletic exercises, as well as for his humility, forbearance, and indomitable good temper, he had the rare gift of changing the course of dangerous conversation without uncouth abruptness or unbecoming dictation, and almost seemed, as is recorded of S. Bernardine of Siena, to check by his mere presence the profane gibe or unseemly *équivoque*. To his great intellectual powers his published "Remains" bear abundant witness; nor do we, in fact, need any other proof of them than the deference yielded to his opinions by such men as those who have acknowledged him for their example and their guide. Let it not be supposed that this high panegyric is prompted by the partiality of friendship. Although I enjoyed constant opportunities of intercourse with Mr. Froude, and made his character a study, yet I have no claim whatever to be considered as his intimate friend. We were not, indeed, at that time, in

anything like complete religious accord; and I remember his once saying to me, in words which subsequent events make me regard as prophetic, "My dear O., I believe you will come right some day, but you are a long time about it." Poor Hurrell Froude! may it be allowed to one who was your competitor in more than one academical contest, and your inferior in everything save in his happy possession of those religious privileges which you were cut off too early to allow of your attaining, to pay you, after many years, this feeble tribute of gratitude and admiration. Never again will Anglicanism produce such a disciple—never, till she is Catholic, will Oxford boast of such a son:—

Hunc tantum terris ostendunt fata, neque ultra  
Esse sinent. Nimium vobis Romana propago  
Visa potens, superi, propria hæc si dona fuissent.  
Nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos  
In tantum spe tollet avos; nec Romula quondam  
Ullo se tantum tellus jactabit alumno.

As I have begun this quotation, I may as well go on with it:—

Heu pietas, heu prisca fides, invictaque bello  
Dextera! non illi quisquam se impune tulisset  
Obvius armato. . . . .  
. . . . . manibus date lilia plenis;  
Purpureos spargam flores, animamque [sodalis]  
His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani  
Munere.\*

To adjust such a character with Catholic facts and Catholic principles is no part of my present object. The reader who takes an interest in this question will find it discussed in Dr. Newman's "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties."† For me, it will be sufficient to take leave of this gifted person in the well-known words, "*Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!*"‡

The characteristic differences which undoubtedly existed among the great leaders of the Tractarian school, although they had no effect—at least for a long time—in marring that front of external unity which the movement itself presented to the public, were not unknown to those who were near the scene of action, and did not wholly escape the notice of keen observers, even at a distance. It soon came to be felt that both Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble, but especially the former,

\* Virg. *Æn.* lib. vi. ad fin.

† Lecture XI.

‡ Since such thou art, ah! would thou hadst been ours.

were considerably in advance of Dr. Pusey in their opinions, as well as materially different from him in *ἡθoς*; and that the principal ground of these differences related, more or less directly, to the proper mode of conducting the controversy with Rome. It was not that Mr. Newman had spoken less strongly than Dr. Pusey upon the alleged corruptions of the Church; for, in fact, he had spoken even more strongly against those supposed corruptions. Still, notwithstanding some painful passages, in one of his works, there was throughout Mr. Newman's writings an undercurrent of sympathy with many parts of the Catholic system which led to the apprehension that these apparent antipathies were *in him*, rather than *of him*—views incidental to his position, which, as a humble disciple of Anglicanism, he felt himself bound to adopt in uninquiring faith, rather than those at which he might have arrived, had he, in a less dutiful spirit, permitted his great intellect to stray in the direction of its congenial speculations. No careful student of the works of the two men could doubt that the bias of Dr. Pusey's mind, and that of Mr. Newman's, were in divergent, if not even opposite directions. But a tangible point of difference between them soon appeared in scarcely disguised form before the observant public. This difference, though it might be represented as relating merely to a point of history, touched, as a matter of fact, very closely upon the essential character of the controversy. It concerned the peculiar opinions and objects of the Anglican Reformers, and therein, by consequence, the theological aspect of the Anglican Reformation. Dr. Pusey had publicly come forward in defence of the orthodoxy of Ridley and Jewell.

The estimate taken, on the contrary, of these men and of their work, by Mr. Froude, Mr. Keble, and Mr. Newman, became sufficiently manifest on the publication of Mr. Froude's "Remains," with the remarks prefixed to them by the friends just mentioned. Mr. Froude had described the English Reformers in general as a "set with whom he wished to have less and less to do." He declared his opinion that Bishop Jewell was no better than an "irreverent dissenter," and expressed himself as sceptical whether Latimer (of whom, as a "martyr," he did not wish to speak disrespectfully) were not "something in the Bulteel line." \* Dr. Pusey was too humble and forbearing to enter any kind of public protest against statements and views so different from his own. But he was

---

\* See Froude's "Remains," vol. i. pp. 251, 379. Mr. Bulteel was a clergyman of the Low Church school, who eventually, I believe, joined the Dissenters.

generally believed not to go along with the tenour of these expressions, nor to approve any otherwise than by passive acquiescence of the publication of those parts of the work in which they were contained.

Such personal differences as existed among the leaders of the Tractarian party, were anything rather than unfavourable to the progress of the movement. In the eyes of friendly critics they furnished an attestation of its sincerity, but they likewise tended to disarm opposition where they did not altogether succeed in conciliating attachment. They formed links of connection between the several leaders and various classes of men throughout the University and the country. Those who did not like one of these leaders could fall back upon another. With able and thoughtful persons, of whatever party, Mr. Newman's name was a sufficient guarantee for the intellectual depth of the opinions; sober and quiet-going churchmen, who did not altogether relish Mr. Newman's and Dr. Pusey's religious antecedents, were diverted from their opposition by the well-known orthodoxy of Mr. Keble. Even the Evangelicals (at least the more religious portion of them), who detested this new manifestation of a theology so essentially opposed to their own, were almost won to forbearance, if not to some kind of sympathy, by the fervid piety of Dr. Pusey; while Mr. Froude's frankness and attractive personal qualities gained from the rising generation of Oxford a favourable hearing for the (to them) original views which he so ably and dashinglly inculcated.

We are here, throughout, considering the movement in its earlier stages. The minds which it drew towards itself at a later period had been formed on a type very different from that of those with which we have been hitherto engaged; and the argument for its depth and reality was thus proportionately strengthened. A more motley group of adherents than it exhibited some years later it is difficult for imagination even to conceive. But it is fair to add that these adhesions were followed by the defection of many among its earliest supporters, and, as time went on, had the effect of completely splitting it in two.

So much, then, for the evidence of depth and solidity which the Tractarian movement derives from its having commended itself to more than one character of mind. I will now say a few words upon a point which is constantly insisted on by its great leaders throughout their published works—I mean the fact that it was not new, but had been, in a measure, anticipated by men who had preceded it, and foreshown by many significant prognostics. One quotation to this effect may



suffice, and it shall be taken from Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf in vindication of the 90th Tract :—

"I have always contended," he says, "and will contend, that it (the religious revival) is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways, and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, still all bear witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something, and, most unhappily, the one religious communion which has of late years been practically in possession of this something is the Church of Rome."\*

I pass over the latter words of this quotation, which constitute one of those tokens to which I have already adverted of the illustrious author's irrepressible sympathies with the Catholic Church. For I am here speaking of its general subject. I do not know that I altogether agree with the illustrious writer as to the individuals whom he has selected for the exemplification of his remarks; but this very probably arises from my own imperfect acquaintance with their writings. At any rate, with the large qualification by which he guards his statement, I should be disposed to add some other names to those which he has specified. In the wide sense of desiring to rise above the thoroughly worldly character of the poetry, philosophy, and divinity of the last century, I should be inclined to couple the name of Cowper with that of Wordsworth among poets, of Burke and Johnson with Coleridge among philosophers, and, in an eminent degree, of William Wilberforce with those religious men who, with whatever excusable deficiencies of doctrine, were almost the first, as a class, to treat sin and grace, and heaven and hell, as practical and urgent realities.

But, to come now to more proximate causes of the Tractarian movement. I am disposed to give a very prominent place among these causes to the teaching of Dr. Charles Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, who died in 1829, about four years before the publication of the "Tracts for the Times." Bishop Lloyd was, I believe, the first to introduce the admirable practice, since adopted by all his successors in the Divinity chair at Oxford, of giving private instruction to candidates for the Anglican ministry, as well as the public lectures which have always been customary. The class of pupils whom Dr. Lloyd assembled between the years

---

\* Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, pp. 25, 26.

1826 and 1828 comprehended all the forementioned leaders of the great Tractarian movement, with the exception of Mr. Keble, who had then left the University. I was myself one of that class, though junior in standing to Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman; and this, therefore, is one of the subjects of these essays in which my testimony is drawn from personal experience. Among other matters which Dr. Lloyd read and discussed with his class was the history of the Council of Trent and that of the Anglican Prayer-book. There were, of course, two ways of treating both of these subjects; but Dr. Lloyd chose the more correct and Catholic one. And I have no doubt whatever that his teaching had a most important influence upon the movement, and—a point to which I wish to draw particular attention—upon that movement in its ultimate and, as I may call it, Roman stage. Upon the subjects of Church Authority, Episcopacy, the Apostolical Succession, and others, with which the earlier Tracts were almost exclusively occupied, I do not remember to have derived any very definite ideas from Dr. Lloyd's teaching; but I do remember to have received from him an entirely new notion of Catholics and of Catholic doctrine. The fact was that Dr. Lloyd, besides being a man of independent thought considerably in advance of the High Churchmen of his time, had enjoyed in his youth many opportunities of intercourse with the French emigrant clergy, to whom he was indebted, as he told us, for truer views of the Catholic religion than were generally current in this country. But his contributions to our future privilege did not end here. In his lectures on the Anglican Prayer-book he made us first acquainted with the Missal and Breviary as the sources from which all that is best and noblest in that compilation is derived; and I have at this time, or lately had, an interleaved Book of Common Prayer with the references to the original sources side by side with the translated passages. It may be easily imagined what an outcry these lectures would have created a few years later; but in the peace and security which then reigned controversy was never thought of on any side, and a favourable opportunity was thus given for casting on the wide waters that bread which was to reappear after many days. Dr. Lloyd's own course was soon run, and came to an abrupt and somewhat melancholy end. Upon the adoption of the great measure of Catholic Emancipation by the Government of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel in 1829, Dr. Lloyd, who owed his bishopric to the friendly intervention of the latter statesman (who had been his pupil), was found in the ranks of its episcopal supporters. Those who, like myself, knew the bias of his mind, could understand how this fact

was sufficiently explained by his general spirit of fairness and forbearance towards Catholics; but the world at large, who had known him only as a High Churchman of Tory principles, attributed his change of opinion to the most unworthy motives; and, being a man of strong feelings, he was unable to bear up against the imputation. Knowing that his vote with ministers would require an apology, he supported it by an eloquent speech, which, in the then prejudiced state of the public mind, only made matters worse. I had the privilege of hearing that speech—it was, in the main, a vindication of Catholic doctrines against Protestant misrepresentation. It led to a bitter altercation with Lord Chancellor Eldon. The Bishop charged the Chancellor with being a mere tyro in logic, and the Chancellor replied, not unnaturally, that such language was fitter for the class-room at Oxford than for their lordships' House. Dr. Lloyd, who was always very kind to me, sent for me the next morning to his lodgings, and I found him literally flushed with his oratorical triumph. In fact, he plainly manifested the symptoms of an incipient fever, which in six weeks resulted in his death. The sad interval was full of events calculated to aggravate the malady. The week after his Parliamentary display he appeared at the *levée*, where the King (George IV.), who regarded the support of Catholic emancipation as a personal insult, treated him with pointed rudeness. What he regarded as a far greater mortification than the rebuff he had experienced from a capricious monarch, was that at his visitation, which followed soon after, the great body of his own clergy refused his invitation to dinner. Vexed and bitterly disappointed, he took to his bed, and a few days later expired—an impressive example of the worthlessness of human success, but a victim, as we may hope, of his zeal in the cause of charity and justice.

Among the facts which heralded in the Tractarian movement and helped, as I must think, towards its real success, was the publication of Mr. Keble's "Christian Year," and its almost unexampled popularity. I am afraid to say how many large editions this work went through in a comparatively short time. It was in everyone's hands; admired by literary men for its poetical beauty, and loved by religious minds for its calm and deep spirit of devotion. Appearing at a time when controversy was not suspected, it was the occasion of circulating—and that too in the form of all others the most attractive and the most valuable—sentiments which, if ever they had a place in the Anglican schools of divinity, had, at all events, been long in abeyance. Not only was it free, to an extent at that time remarkable, from anti-Catholic phraseology,

but it dared to plead, in terms than which even a Catholic could use no stronger, for the love of which our Blessed Lady should be the object.\* The natural and affectionate use of the Holy Name was another of its characteristics, which, strange to say, placed it in contrast to the High Church publications of the time, and won for it an access to many an Evangelical hearth from which the well-known religious opinions of its author might otherwise have banished it. The work was thus, in all probability, the means of insinuating principles, and infusing a spirit, which prepared the way for a more favourable reception of the Tractarian theology than that theology might have received if not pre-announced by so popular a forerunner.

I cannot help thinking, although I am not sure if the opinion be shared by others, that the great religious movement in question was favoured to a considerable extent by the peculiar character of the education, both philosophical and classical, by which the Oxford of those days was distinguished. The basis of the former was the great moral treatise of Aristotle, the *Ethics*, which contains, as I need not say, the skeleton of our own system of Moral Theology. The Aristotelian ethics, with the Christian philosophy of Bishop Butler as their commentary and supplement, entered into the academical education of all the more cultivated minds of Oxford, and contributed, in a pre-eminent degree, to form their character and regulate their tone. In the absence of anything like a powerful and consistent teaching on the part of the Established Church, this positive philosophy was a real boon. Those, of course, who had no higher object in their academical life than to gain the honours of the Schools, studied this philosophy, like everything else, with an eye merely to that secondary end. But more thoughtful minds found in it a deeper meaning and a more practical use. No one can read Mr. Froude's "Remains," for instance, without seeing, that with him, and with those with whom he corresponded, the ethical system of Oxford had exercised no small influence in the formation of mental habits. Those who, like myself, were personally acquainted with Mr. Froude, will remember how constantly he used to appeal to this great moral teacher of antiquity, ("Old 'Stotle," as he used playfully to call him,) against the shallow principles of the day.† There is a sense, I am convinced, in which the

---

\* Ave Maria, thou whose name  
All but adoring love may claim.

*Christian Year: Feast of the Annunciation.*

† Mr. Froude's "Letters to Friends" furnish abundant evidence of a mind formed upon the best Oxford model. (See "Remains," vol. i. pp. 170, 249, 329, 363, 367-8, 375-6, &c.)

literature of heathenism is often more religious than that of Protestantism. Thus, then, it was that the philosophical studies of Oxford tended to form certain great minds on a semi-Catholic type.

I wish I had space to do more than indicate a similar impression with regard to the (then) classical education of Oxford, which made critical scholarship less an end in itself, than the means towards a certain habit of mind. It was an education which fed the chivalrous and romantic spirit of youth, and which formed those capacities for the perception of the beautiful, of which the Catholic religion is the sole adequate correlative. Hence those accomplished scholars of the olden time, who have not become Catholics, such as Mr. Keble and Mr. Isaac Williams, have been apt to invest their own religion with an ideal beauty, which has been to them, unhappily, a kind of substitute for the reality. Meanwhile, where is it but in the Catholic Church, her storied annals, her world-wide exploits, her awful sanctity, her varied devotions, her versatile institutions, her graceful and loving ceremonial, that romance finds its noblest field of investigation, and the love of the beautiful its most congenial sphere of exercise? The natural reverence of Æschylus, the all but inspired flights of Pindar, the philosophic vein of the reflective Sophocles, the fascinating elegance of Virgil, and even the pathetic moralism of the voluptuous Horace,—where do they find the light which illustrates their instinctive guesses, the substance which corresponds with their dim foreshadowings, the agent which precipitates their dross and brings out their gold? In the theory, the history, and the actual manifestations of Holy Church.\*

It was about the year 1833 that the Tractarian movement actually took its rise, in the publication of the first of the "Tracts for the Times." The more immediate occasion of this attempt to reanimate the Established Church with the spirit of ancient times, is said by Mr. William Palmer, of Worcester College, in his "Narrative of Events" connected with the publication of the Tracts, to have been the exhibition on the part of the Government of an increasing desire to subject the National Church to the influence of the State; and the destruction of the ancient landmarks which had separated the Establishment, on the one hand from the Roman Catholics,

---

\* For an illustration, I might point to the "Promessi Sposi," or to "Fabiola." It is hardly necessary for me to say that I am not here pronouncing any opinion upon the *religious* advantages of a classical education *in the abstract*. The case of Oxford was in more than one respect quite peculiar, and wholly independent of that complicated question.

and on the other from the Dissenters, by the then recent repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the emancipation of Catholics from civil disabilities, and other measures of a similar character. Those who desire to acquaint themselves with the circumstances under which the Tracts arose, and the differences of opinion which were the cause of division among their authors almost from the first, and ultimately of a complete separation of the more backward from the more advanced disciples of the school, will do well to consult Mr. Palmer's "Narrative," which will be found to bear out some of the remarks contained in the present essay.

The objects with which the Tracts were originally started will sufficiently account for the tenour of those which came earliest in the series. The earlier numbers will be found to turn principally upon the points in which the Established Church is supposed to mediate between the two extremes of "Romanism" and Latitudinarianism, as well as upon the claims of that body to a share in those hereditary privileges of an Apostolic society which Catholics consider to have been fatally impaired by the great schism of the sixteenth century. This portion of the subject has so little interest for Catholics, whom alone I am here addressing, that I gladly follow the dictate of my own inclination by passing it over. In truth it is a phase of the movement which never presented any features of attraction either to my own mind or to that of others whom the movement eventually absorbed into itself. I can confidently assert that the hardest trial to which my faith was ever exposed was that of being asked to see in the Anglican bishops the successors of the Apostles. I have not a word to say against those prelates, many of whom were amiable and estimable men; but to look upon them, in their collective character, as the lineal descendants of St. Peter and St. Paul was another matter altogether. It was not the seat in the Lords, for that might be an accident; nor the *cong   d'  lire*, for that might be an usurpation. Neither was it altogether the handsome equipage and the numerous retinue, the palace with its imposing exterior, or the castle with its princely domain, for these might, without much difficulty, be located in the Catholic system: they had their counterparts in Catholic countries, and some of them were even the heritage of Catholic times. But it was those characteristics of the institution which appeal rather to the imagination than to the reason which made havoc of the illusion: the peculiar phenomena of the individuals, their families, and their establishments—the air of profound official serenity and dogged domesticity which floated around them—these it was which, antecedently to all investigation, and as an



almost insuperable preliminary prejudice to it, seemed to imply some fatal flaw in the Apostolic pedigree, and to indicate some bar of illegitimacy athwart the royal escutcheon. Nor did it seem any injustice to the persons in question to hesitate in attributing to them prerogatives which, for a long time at least, they appeared to be themselves as anxious to disclaim as others to force upon them. Those respectable men had been in the habit of regarding themselves but as dignified gentlemen; when lo! they suddenly woke up to the consciousness that they were successors of the Apostles. They looked around them, about them, and within them: "*Miranturque novas frondes, et non sua poma.*" Far from realizing the magnitude of the claim, they were at first so bewildered by its novelty as scarcely to be able to understand its nature. Was it an increase of work, or an accession of dignity?—a weapon in the hand, or a feather in the cap?—a demand upon vigilance, or an occasion of "doing homage?" As time went on, however, they found the use of their new power. Those who had preached up episcopal authority had preached as its correlative the duty of implicit obedience. Though others might dispute their new title, and did so, yet in one quarter at least they were sure of finding a practical recognition of it; on the part of those, namely, to whom they were indebted for its donation. For many a long day they had lamented the powerlessness of their threats and the inefficacy of their commands. But better times were at hand: they could now fulminate with freedom and charge with vigour, for they were sure not only of a patient hearing but of a willing submission. And charge they did, on the right hand and on the left; from north to south, and from east to west—from Durham to Salisbury, and from Lincoln to Llandaff,—and soon the captives were to be seen crouching in their cells, their limbs crippled with fetters and manacles of their own forging; while he who was the principal object of the aim lay prostrate on the ground like a stricken eagle, the victim of the arrow which himself had plumed.\*

Had the influence of the Tractarian movement been confined within the range of mere literature, it might have been very many years in spreading itself; and, in all probability, would never have succeeded in gaining that hold on the public mind, which, as a fact, it asserted with almost miraculous rapidity. Literature proper has but a slender influence on human action unless when powerfully aided by collateral supports or by the predisposition of the public. Neither of these auxiliaries was

---

\* For a most humorous description of this situation, see Dr. Newman's "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties." (Sect. v. pp. 125-6; first ed.)

actually wanting in the case of the Tracts. They evidently responded to some craving which was not felt to exist till its satisfaction was supplied. But the teaching of the Tracts also required for its due effect some vast machinery of oral instruction to explain, to amplify, and to qualify it. For it consisted, as truly understood, not in certain doctrines only, but in a great ethical system, by which the whole character was to be leavened, and not merely the reason convinced. The place in which the movement arose was, of all others, the most favourable for this purpose. The University of Oxford is both a centre which draws to itself all that is powerful in this country, and a source from which those elements return to their several spheres of influence with an immense accession of strength, whether for good or for evil. Moreover, Oxford possesses, so far as a Protestant University can possess it, a most valuable apparatus of oral teaching. Its lecture-rooms in the several colleges furnish, to those who preside in them, abundant means of moulding the ductile mind of youth in one or another form; while its pulpits, parochial as well as academical, where filled by able and earnest preachers, may easily be made, as they have been made, materially instrumental to the same end. The former of these means of influence—the lecture-room—was all but completely barred, by the exercise of authority, against the approaches of Tractarianism. Tutors of colleges who were known to share the new opinions, were speedily disposed of by some one among those hundred methods of regulating his society according to his own views which the head of a college possesses; while younger men who might be aspirants after the same position were still more easily prevented from ever arriving at it. Many methods would occur to the anti-Tractarian president or master for the attainment of his object. He might crush the spirit of the unhappy juvenile by snubbing him at collections, by quarrelling with his exercises, by cold looks and cutting words at other times; and, as a last resource, by sending him upon some plea of health or college necessity into the country. These methods of petty persecution, which were extensively resorted to in the hope of checking the progress of Tractarianism among the junior members of the University, have been so admirably described by Dr. Newman in his inimitable tale of "Loss and Gain," that no more need be said of them in this place. Even the higher tribunals of the University were sometimes perverted to the same party uses. The candidate for a B.A. degree was often obliged to choose between the risk of losing his "testamur" or his honours, and the necessity of declaring, at the dictation of his examiner, that the Mass was a fatal error; Purgatory a

"fond thing;" and Roman Catholics the true modern representatives of the Jewish Pharisees; and, as Tractarians were apt to be troubled with tender consciences, the result of the alternative was generally against them. Even the School of Divinity was turned into a court of inquisition; and on a celebrated occasion the Regius Professor of that faculty endeavoured to convert a zealous admirer of Tractarian principles by refusing him his degree, unless he would consent to accept a thesis so worded by the Professor as to admit but of one mode of treatment, and to treat it according to the views of doctrine which he (the Professor) espoused.

But the other instrument of moral power to which allusion has been made—the pulpit—was not quite so manageable a weapon. The University pulpit, indeed, had a two-sided effect upon the movement; for the conditions of that institution entail a constant variety of preachers; and, as the Tractarians were of course in the minority, their sermons bore a very small proportion to those of their opponents. And almost every hot-headed parson who came from the country to preach before the University in his turn, came with a determination to crush the iniquitous system by some palmary argument similar to that by which the Scotchman proposed to convert the Pope. But, all this while a course of pulpit-teaching was going on in the same church, which, unlike that we have just spoken of, was continuous and uniform. No sooner had St. Mary's been cleared of its dignified audience, than a new congregation was gathered together within its walls, ostensibly consisting of parishioners, but really comprehending a large number of the members, especially the junior members, of the University. This service, like its companion in the forenoon, was conducted entirely by Mr. Newman, who had succeeded, in his turn, as Fellow of Oriel, to the incumbency of the parish. Mr. Newman was, in fact, everything in this office—alike without rival and without coadjutor; he was reader, preacher, and celebrant; nay, music and ceremonial also; for, if these various departments were ever actually filled by others, they have faded from the memory, which has settled down on him alone. It was from that pulpit that Sunday after Sunday were delivered those marvellous discourses which have been since collected into several volumes, and of which it may be said that there is hardly a sentence which does not form a study for the philosopher. Nor was it in the pulpit alone that Mr. Newman had the gift of throwing a character essentially his own over the work in which he was engaged. He succeeded in imparting to the Anglican service, and especially to that portion of it which from the lips of most clergymen

was either an unimpressive recital or a pompous effort—the reading of the lessons—an indescribable charm of touching beauty, and a wonderful power of instructive efficacy. His delivery of Scripture was a sermon in which you forgot the human preacher; a drama in which the vividness of the representation was marred by no effort and degraded by no art. He stood before the sacred volume as if penetrating its contents to their very centre, so that his manner alone, his pathetic changes of voice, or his thrilling pauses, seemed to convey the commentary in the simple enunciation of the text. He brought out meanings where none had been even suspected, and invested passages which in the hands of the profane are often the subject of unbecoming levity, with a solemnity which forced irreverence to retire abashed into its hiding-places. In fact, for a non-Catholic ministration, nothing could be more perfect. It is the Church alone which completely merges the individual in the office, and which can afford, therefore, to dispense with every form of rhetorical embellishment, however legitimate, in the utterance of prayer or the recital of the Written Word. But I have often regarded Mr. Newman's mode of reading the lessons, with the inimitable power of representation which he threw into them, as a kind of foreshadowing, or, as I may say, apologetic counterpart, of that sublime idea which the Church has embodied in the quasi-dramatic recital of the Passion in Holy Week.

The charm of the ministration to which I have just referred had scarcely less effect in securing the presence, and rivetting the attention, of a devout and highly educated congregation than the masterly discourses which followed it. There were particular chapters of the Old Testament (for, as it was evening service of which I am speaking, the narrative portion of the New did not enter into the lessons), to the recurrence of which people used almost to look forward as master specimens of the peculiar power in question. The sacrifice of Isaac by his father, the history of Joseph and his brethren, the passage of the Red Sea, and the history of Balaam, are portions of the Old Testament which gave especial opportunity for its exercise. Ah! it might almost make one weep to think of the change which has come over that University; of the blight of scepticism and infidelity which has penetrated, to all appearance, to its core, and poisoned the very well-springs of faith and love. Unhappy Oxford!—

Not poppy nor mandragora,  
Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,  
Shall ever med'cine thee to that sweet sleep  
Which thou owedst yesterday.

The spirit of confidence has fled; the demon of mistrust has entered in; and there is no charmer now to lure it away by the music of his song; no exorcist to bid it avaunt by the power of his word. One panacea alone remains—the authority of an infallible Church, and the gift of a childlike faith.

The second act of the drama which I am engaged in evolving, opens with the publication of the celebrated 90th Tract, upon which, if such be the editor's kind pleasure, the curtain shall rise in a future paper.

Before concluding, however, I must briefly advert to an event which belongs to the period we have just traversed, and not to that upon which we have still to enter. Mr. Froude had now passed away from the scene of his earthly labours. Towards the close of his mortal career his opinions appear to have undergone some change, which was perceptible to many of his friends even in his outward demeanour. He associated less than formerly with the old High Church party of the Establishment, as he became convinced that the ills of the Church must be cured by sterner and more unworldly methods of discipline than that party was prepared to accept. An air of gravity and a tone of severity, even in general society (so far as he mixed with it), had replaced that bright and sunny cheerfulness which was characteristic of his earlier days; and this change of exterior was greater than could be explained by his declining health, against which he bore up with exemplary fortitude. Together with a more anxious view of the state and prospects of the Establishment, he had apparently taken up a less favourable opinion of the Catholic Church, at least, in its actual manifestation. A visit to the Continent had operated, from whatever cause, unfavourably upon his judgment of Catholics, whom he now first stigmatized as "Tridentines,"—a strange commentary, certainly, on the view put forth later by Mr. Newman, to the effect that the prevalent Catholic system was erroneous, in that it had deviated from the Tridentine rule,—not in that it represented that rule. This and similar dicta (some of a still more painful import) have led such of Mr. Froude's friends as have clung to the Established Church to believe that, had he lived, he would have remained on their side. Such a question will naturally be determined, to a great extent, according to the personal views and wishes of those who speculate upon it. Certain, at any rate, it is that, had he come to us, the Church would have secured the humble obedience and faithful service of a rarely gifted intellect; while, had he stayed behind, he would have added one more to the number of those whose absence is the theme of our lamentation, and whose conversion the object of our prayers.

It is part, however, of the historian's office to investigate such questions according to the evidence at his disposal; and, in the instance before us, that evidence is far more accessible and far more satisfactory than is usually the case in posthumous inquiries. Mr. Froude's "Letters to Friends," published in his "Remains," give an insight into his character and feelings, with all their various developments and vicissitudes, such as is commonly the privilege of intimate personal acquaintance, and of that alone. His bosom friends could hardly have known him better than the careful student of these letters may know him, if he desire it; indeed, it is to such friends that he discloses himself in those letters with almost the plain-spokenness of the confessional.

Now it must be admitted that these letters leave the question as to the probability of his conversion very much in that evenly-balanced state in which, as we have just said, the wishes of friends or partisans come in to determine it on either side. His letters contain, on the one hand, many passages from which, if they stood alone, it might be concluded that he was, at certain times, almost ripe for conversion. They also contain others apparently of an opposite tenour. In the former class must be reckoned those indications of antipathy, continually deriving fresh fuel from new researches, to the English Reformation and Reformers.\* Mr. Froude's theological sentiments had long passed the mark of the Laudian era, and settled at the point of the Non-jurors.† He thinks "one might take" for an example "Francis de Sales," whom, by the way, he classes with Jansenist saints.‡ Again, he was most deeply sensitive to the shortcomings and anomalies of his communion; he calls it an "incubus" on the country, and ascribes to it the blighting properties of the "upas-tree."§ It is evident that he was in advance both of Mr. Keble and of Mr. Newman: he twits the former, in friendly expostulation, with the Protestantism of his phraseology in parts of the "Christian Year," and laments the backwardness of the latter on some questions of the day.|| On the other hand, and in the same direction of thought, he expresses admiration of Cardinal Pole;¶ he scruples about speaking against the Catholic system—even its "*seemingly indifferent practices*;"\*\* he can understand, on the principle of reverence,

---

\* Froude's Remains, vol. i. pp. 389, 393, 394, &c.

† Ibid. p. 363.

‡ Ibid. p. 395.

§ Ibid. pp. 403, 405, &c.

|| Ibid. pp. 326, 394, 395, 403, 417, &c.

¶ Ibid. p. 254.

\*\* Ibid. pp. 336, 395.



the communion under one species\*—perhaps the greatest of all practical difficulties to many Anglican minds. Moreover, when at Rome, he evidently opened the subject of reconciliation to a distinguished prelate whom he met there.†

*Per contra*, we have painful sayings against supposed practical abuses in the Church. He “really thought,” as he tells us, “that certain practices” which he witnessed abroad are “idolatrous;” he charges priests with irreverence, ecclesiastical authorities with laxity, &c.‡ Yet even these opinions he partially qualifies, and is disposed to attribute to defective information.§ He shrinks from speaking against Rome “as a Church” (p. 395).

Unwilling as I am to hazard conjectures on the subject, especially against the judgment of any among his more intimate friends, I do not think it unreasonable to conclude, from a comparison of these passages, that Mr. Froude’s objections were chiefly directed against imaginary abuses, or possible relaxations of discipline, which time and reflection would have shown him to be entirely independent of the real merits of the controversy. I find it also difficult to believe that, as the principles of the English Reformation received those illustrations in the Established Church which we have lived long enough to see,—as her constituted tribunals were found to give up in succession the grace of the Sacraments, the authority of the Church, and even the inspiration of Holy Scripture itself, as necessary truths,—his clear and honest mind would not have accepted some or all of these tokens of apostasy as a summons to enter the True Fold. Assuredly, too, we have known no instance of a mind equally candid, intelligent, and instructed, whose advances in the direction of the Truth (especially where assisted by extraordinary acuteness of conscience and purity of life) have stopped short, as time has gone on, of the logical conclusion, except in cases where the progress of such a mind has been arrested by conflicting tendencies of deeply ingrained Protestant or national prepossession—such as in his instance were singularly absent.

There is, however, one phase of Mr. Froude’s mind with which it is far more difficult to reconcile the belief of his probable conversion than any other. This phase, indeed, seems to have been a characteristic of himself, as compared

---

\* Froude’s Remains, vol. i. p. 410. See the passage, “*If I were a Roman Catholic Priest*,” &c.

† Ibid. p. 306.

‡ These passages are collected in the Editor’s Preface to the “Remains,” p. 11, et seq.

§ See Preface, p. 14, et alibi.

with nearly all of those who took a leading part in the movement, including even Mr. Keble, who, on the whole, was the nearest to Mr. Froude in general character. The peculiarity to which I refer, is that of an extraordinary leaning to the side of religious dread, and a corresponding suppression of the sentiments of love and joy. Mr. Froude's religion, so far as it can be gathered from his published journal, seems to have been (if the expression be not too strong) more like that of a humble and pious Jew under the Old Dispensation, than of a Christian living in the full sunshine of Gospel privileges. The apology for this feature in his religious character, and for any portion of it which appears in those of other excellent men of the same period, is to be found in the ungraceful and often irreverent form in which the warmer side of the Christian temper was exhibited in the party called by courtesy Evangelical, whose language, based as it was upon grievous errors of doctrine, had a tendency to react in religious minds on the side of severity and reserve. Such a form of religious spirit, however, when exhibited in the somewhat unusual proportions which it assumes in Mr. Froude, must undergo almost a complete revolution before it can be naturally susceptible of the impressions which Catholic devotion has a tendency to produce, or even tolerant of the language which pervades our approved manuals. It is certainly difficult to find in the Mr. Froude of the "Remains" a compartment for devotion to our Blessed Lady, for instance, or even to the Sacred Humanity of our Lord, in all its attractive and endearing fulness. Yet, taking the phenomena of his case as a whole, and duly estimating the respective powers of the two conflicting forces, I cannot help thinking that the Church would more easily have conquered his prejudices than the Establishment have retained his allegiance.

FREDERICK OAKELEY.

*(To be continued.)*

---

## THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.

[The paper that follows is from the pen of an excellent Catholic, who has access to unusually good sources of information on the subject of which he treats, and whose opinions are worthy of most respectful consideration. We believe, therefore, that we do our readers a service in publishing his remarks.]

**A**BOUT a month ago the French world was taken by surprise; and though a few wiseacres had sapiently nodded their heads, and foretold some sort of modification in the Imperial system of government, yet the public in general had not expected such a thorough change in the heavings and workings of that dark spirit which, either for good or for evil, rules at present over Europe. And so—again I repeat it—France was taken by surprise. However, when the first burst of astonishment was over, every reflective mind felt that this new move on the part of the Emperor in the right direction was, after all, the effect of a certain cause, the practical result of a long string of leading circumstances. Leaving metaphor aside, the late changes wrought in the French Cabinet by the Arch-will, were due to the General Elections of 1863. So, all of a sudden, the grand elector M. de Persigny marched out of the Home Department; whilst three other ministers, M. Delangle, M. Rouland, and M. Walewski, were politely waved out of the Cabinet. Again, M. Baroche, who for twelve long years has been labouring like a galley-slave, both in the Corps Législatif and in the Council of State, is allowed at last to court a more quiet life in the Ministry of Justice and Public Worship. This poor man, so lately buffeted about and bruised by his quarrelsome friend, De Persigny, must surely exclaim with the poet:—

*Libertas : quæ sera, tamen respexit inertem ;  
Candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat :  
Respexit tamen, et longo post tempore venit.*

Whilst he adds, surely, in the secret of his own heart:—

————— *Deus nobis hæc otia fecit.*

The god, indeed, has spoken; and the same powerful words which made the above-mentioned gentlemen topple down from their heights, have likewise conjured up new puppets, destined

to dance awhile before an applauding public, whilst the *impresario* holds the wires behind the scenes, and prepares to whistle the same song, though in a different key.

These new men are, after all, but old ones, dressed out in an Imperial garb. M. Boudet, who has superseded M. de Persigny, is a veteran of the antiquated parliamentary system, as well as a long-standing friend of M. Billault's, who presided over a section of the Council of the State. He likewise superintends the management of the *Moniteur*, by no means an unimportant engine under the present system. M. Boudet is well known for his eminent administrative qualifications; and this is a high encomium when applied to the successor of a man who was noted for his utter disregard of every rule and exigency belonging to the usual routine of his office.

Another Minister, M. Armand Béhic, had likewise made himself known, before 1848, as a hard-working and highly intelligent director, who in our own country would probably have ranked with Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, or any other praiseworthy practical statesman. In France, he had lately given new proofs of his capacity as the able manager of the Mediterranean and Atlantic Company (*Compagnie des Messageries Impériales*), which bids fair to compete successfully with our best Transatlantic undertakings. M. Béhic now holds the post of Minister of Commerce and of Public Works.

As for M. Duruy, the new Minister for Public Instruction, his appointment is not only surprising, but borders somewhat upon the romantic. He held a professorship in one of the Parisian grammar-schools, and, probably to eke out the pecuniary shortcomings of his official station, had successively published several historical class-books, which enjoyed a well-earned reputation. The Emperor, in his own studies relative to old Cæsar, happened some time ago to read M. Duruy's Roman History, and was struck with many of its leading features. He consequently sought for an interview with the author, which ended in the latter placing himself at the disposal of his Imperial Master. Little by little a sort of intimacy grew up between them; and it is almost needless to add that M. Duruy was by no means the loser by their mutual intercourse, having rapidly risen in the ranks of the State University, and still more so, perhaps, in the Sovereign's favour. This does not in the slightest degree imply any servile spirit on the part of the new Minister, who, if reports speak true, was no less astonished than other people at his elevation to such a high place of trust and confidence. M. Duruy appears to be a man of liberal feelings and opinions, but, unfortunately, he is known to be hostile to the temporal power of the Pope; and

some of his bosom friends whisper that *he* it was who wrote the flaming speeches of M. Bonjean against Rome, during the late session; whilst the noble senator and *alter ego* of Prince Napoleon did little else but learn them by heart. At any rate, the writer of these lines could almost vouch for the truth of the fact; which does not forebode, on the part of M. Duruy, much favour to the clerical schools throughout France.

One of the most remarkable features of the changes lately brought about in the French Cabinet is the abolition of speaking Ministers (*Ministres sans portefeuille*). From the very beginning it was considered as a most awkward and roundabout way of making up for that deficiency in public speakers which unfortunately stamped the late Cabinet. Talkers, indeed, there were some among them, such as M. Rouland for instance; but orators there were none. Yet even the talent of M. Billault and M. Baroche could hardly maintain its ground against the rising Opposition in both houses—when they had to contend with men who, whatever might be their failings in regard to real eloquence, possessed at least that sterling and convincing quality of speaking their own minds and opinions. A Minister "*sans portefeuille*," on the contrary, was merely an echo condemned to repeat another man's words, and to defend measures which at the bottom of his heart he often disapproved, or would have readily cancelled. I could easily produce many proofs of this fact:—let one suffice. M. Billault strongly attacked before the Senate that society of S. Vincent de Paul, which no insinuation, no would-be State reason, could induce him to subvert as long as he himself was at the head of the Home Department.

So, according to the new transformation of the French Government, all intercourse between the Crown and the Chambers must henceforward take place through the medium of M. Billault as Minister of State, and of M. Rouher as President of the Council of State. Both might be termed leaders, though in a very different sense from the meaning an Englishman would attach to that well-known wheel of our parliamentary engine. But, at any rate, the above arrangements, when taken all together, go far beyond a mere change of persons, and must be viewed as an important evolution or alteration in the Imperial system. On the part of Napoleon III. they amount to a praiseworthy attempt to conform his government to a new situation manifested by the general elections. Few monarchs wielding absolute power are keen-sighted enough to read the signs of the coming storm in the deep blue sky of a summer day; fewer still are

they who, having read these signs, are wise enough to seize the helm with a bold hand and steer at once the gallant ship to a safe though distant harbour. The adventurous *parvenu* who is now seated on the throne of France seems a spirit cast in that mould, if we may judge from his past and present. Without launching out into an investigation alike foreign to our general subject, and premature in the present day, it is at least worth our while to take a rapid survey of the internal policy of France during the last six years. It is indeed the only way to apprehend fully the movement which has but just become apparent, and seems destined to end once more in the permanent establishment of liberty. If it be added that the Church will most probably benefit by that liberty—expand under its protection—gain strength and health and beauty from breathing the pure air of freedom—what Catholic reader will not become immediately interested in the following remarks, gleaned from personal observation, and grounded, I may venture to say, on a thorough knowledge of our powerful neighbours?

The period included between 1852 and 1857 may be summed up in two words:—political lethargy. Every man in France seemed absorbed in one engrossing idea:—making money and making order. Making order, I say, because every man's hand would have been instantly raised against the hare-brained adventurer presumptuous enough to think, much less to speak, of a free government or free institutions. Something of the kind must have taken place in Rome when Augustus assumed the reins of power, and when every Roman hastened to worship the rising sun, or, as Tacitus finely expresses it, "ruere in servitium." In France, at least, there was some reason for this general disposition to abjure all former principles, and to acknowledge the necessity of a strong hand. I mean the utter absence of respect for any established law or authority, which for years and years had characterized the French nation. If the present Government achieves no greater feat than to instil a feeling of awe into the minds of the people, still it would stand high in the eyes of posterity. In more senses than one are those words true:—"Initium sapientiæ timor Domini."

I insist the more upon this general tendency of every class in France during the first five or six years of the Imperial *régime*, because of late it has become the fashion to forget these times and dispositions. Legitimists, Orleanists, nay, even Republicans themselves, were all glad to get rid of anarchy, or, at least, of a most perilous sort of liberty, wearing



the garb of licence. Here again we are reminded of the Roman historian, when he says in his strong language:—  
“Cum ferocissimi per vires aut proscriptione cecidissent, ceteri nobilium, quanto quis servitio promptior, opibus et honoribus extollerentur, ac novis ex rebus aucti, tuta et præsentia, quam vetera et periculosa mallent.” And I may add, that among the vast body of French peasantry, the very name of Napoleon acted as a charm and a spell that made them fall down upon their knees, and address to a sort of legendary being that worship which many often refused to their God and Maker.

But in a Christian and civilized country such a state of things can never become permanent. At the bottom of every soul redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ there lies, either dormant or awake, a feeling of dignity that instinctively rises against all arbitrary power. As free agents and responsible beings, we soon find out that no earthly prince has a right to rule exclusively over both our minds and bodies. And indeed this is the very reason why among Christian nations anything like heathen or Asiatic despotism is an impossibility; for whatever bad tendencies we may attribute in this direction to the First Napoleon, or to Nicholas of Russia, still in their worst moments did they never come near to the crowned monsters of ancient Rome.

The very first signs of a reaction in France may be traced to the elections of 1857. On the 30th of May in that year M. Billault, then Minister of the Interior, addressed a circular to the prefects, in which he laid down the rules and principles of the Government in regard to the elections. After extolling the services and devotedness of the late Chamber, he declared that, “with very few exceptions, rendered necessary by special circumstances, the Government deemed it both expedient and equitable to present for re-election the members of an Assembly which had deserved so well both of the Emperor and of the country.” The reader will do well to bear in mind that, according to the French system, the Administration puts forth, and patronizes by every means at its disposal, a certain number of official candidates, thus assuming the perilous duties of arch-cavasser for the whole Empire. More than one wit has repeatedly asked why the Emperor should not at once appoint the deputies, as he does any other public agent or functionary. The system would certainly have the merit of great simplicity.

That M. Billault was not, however, of such an opinion, is shown by the sequel of his circular, which M. de Persigny might have endorsed in 1863: “Together with those official candidates, openly admitted and resolutely maintained, others

of an opposite character may come forward freely. Of late, our legislation in regard to the canvassing has been maligned; and yet our rules are both simple and liberal." He then proceeds to lay down the law, and winds up by an urgent appeal "to our loyal country labourers and to the intelligent artisans of our cities." One of the most striking passages of this circular is certainly the following: "Fearing," says M. Billault, "that their unbounded confidence in the Government may induce them to abstain from the poll, I trust that the prefects will strongly urge upon the electors the necessity of voting, were it but to drown in an immense manifestation of the people the imperceptible minority of hostile parties." I could produce no better proof of the universal apathy than the above official statements.

The resolution adopted by the Government to recommend the re-election of the whole former Assembly, and consequently to excommunicate, as it were, every other candidate, was approved of by a few, and blamed by many. To be sure, it was an easy and convenient mode of maintaining the *statu quo*; but was it a just measure, or was it conformable to a sound policy, as the Minister had so positively proclaimed it to be in his circular? He had himself admitted that, "either taking advantage of their old and well-approved devotion, or loyally rallying round a dynasty which had done so much for the glory and security of the nation, many men of high standing by their fortune, talents, and due influence, had solicited the honour of becoming official candidates." Then wherefore exclude them systematically? Was not this actually to provoke discontent both among the discarded candidates and among certain groups of population, desirous indeed of supporting the Government, but no less desirous of being seriously consulted as to the choice of their representatives? And again, it was but prudent to remember that, after the elections of 1852—in other words, on the very morrow of a revolution—a large number of such men as are ever ready to support a successful cause, and are ever enthusiastic admirers of sheer force, had managed to be returned by certain departments, whilst men of real influence and popularity in these same provinces had stood aloof, and left free scope to strangers sent purposely from Paris, to canvass for places where their very names were scarcely known. Was it wise and prudent, five years after, to hold forth those self-same people against others of higher importance in every respect? Besides, if a seat in the Chamber became a sort of life-rent in favour of a Government minion, what was to become of so many old families, still associated with the memories and vicissitudes of provincial life—still looked up to

by the population itself as so many ornaments to the country, where their ancient pedigrees or newly-acquired honours had struck deep roots in the parent soil?

There was doubtless some truth in these observations and criticisms, which were, however, expressed *sotto voce*, and with such humility as is incumbent upon those who do not enjoy freedom of speech. True, there might be cogent reasons for excluding certain candidates; but when among the exceptions figured such a man as Montalembert, the impartial looker-on could entertain no other feeling but regret, and even disgust. The new-fangled ostracism came out in the eyes of the public in odious colours when thus applied; for Count de Montalembert is certainly no revolutionist, nor did he pass six years ago for being inimical to the Imperial Government. He had not only bowed his head under the *coup d'état* of 1851, but had even, to a certain extent, welcomed it. His opposition to the decrees levelled against the property of the Orleans family was doubtless strong—some might even say violent,—but it never arrived at being factious. The Legislative body seldom voted with that illustrious orator, but always listened to his impassioned eloquence with respect, and even deference, because no one mistrusted his sincerity. It seems, therefore, very doubtful whether it was consistent with political wisdom on the part of M. Billault to wage open war against such a man, and to supersede him in the national Assembly by one of the Emperor's chamberlains. Such blows do far more injury to their originators than to the enemy they are destined to crush for ever.

It is important for our comprehension of the present crisis in France to dwell upon this retrospective view of the elections of 1857. They are truly and verily the key and clue to those of 1863. The botanist studies with no less interest the acorn than the wide-spread oak, that has weathered the storms of a thousand years. The reader must, therefore, bear with me a little longer before I proceed to comment upon passing events.

In countries where the representative system thrives and prospers, a period of general elections is ever accompanied with a certain amount of political agitation. Every party is preparing for the contest: circulars, meetings, addresses are multiplied in every direction. The press, above all, echoes back the din of preparation for the impending battle. The candidates are unassuming, unpretending, ready to answer every query, whether it proceeds from the highest or the lowest in the land. At the time I am speaking of, in France, there was nothing of the kind. The official candidates were so sure of an overwhelming majority, that in most of the electoral

districts they had even no competitor, and the main object of the prefects was to bring up to the poll the electors, who would gladly have abstained from voting, being fully convinced that the Government could dispense with their services. In a few towns alone, such as Bordeaux, Lyons, and Paris, was there anything like animation; and even this was confined within certain very modest limits. As for the newspapers, they showed what we should call "pluck" nowhere but in the metropolis, where old associations and the presence of some men of importance emboldened them to maintain their ground. But even here it was little better than a low murmur:—

—— Parvæ murmura vocis.

After all, it could scarcely have been otherwise, for the old political parties appeared to have given up any share in the government of the country. Each of them, indeed, considered as an individual entity, was by far too weak in numbers, too devoid of influence, to assume the guidance of public opinion. On the other hand, they did not even agree as to their own principles or leading doctrines, so that a coalition—even supposing it to be practicable—could never last. On the eve of the elections, the Opposition of every hue and dye was yet putting the question whether they were to vote or not; and in the midst of such general confusion we can hardly understand how Paris returned *five* Radical members out of ten, which then made up the group of deputies for the French capital.

Such were the Elections of 1857, which gave an almost unanimous Assembly to the Government; but, at the same time, brought home to many a mind the fact, that this overwhelming majority was due to the country electors and rural districts. This fact was so evident, that an important newspaper of the time, the *Assemblée Nationale*, boldly expressed its opinion in the following words: "In the late elections it would be difficult to see one of those free and spontaneous manifestations of public opinion which carry conviction to every impartial mind as to the union of the country with its government. The country parishes have indeed greatly contributed to the general result of the present election; but still we must not lose sight of the pressure of Government, when we compare the opposition and abstention of large towns with the devotedness and adherence of the rural districts."

During the three following years such important events occurred in Italy that the French Legislative Assembly, as well as every other internal incident, was utterly overlooked. The only bearing which that memorable war had upon the actual occurrences and elections in France, was the gradual change

they effected among the Catholic clergy. Since 1849, the latter, headed by their bishops and principal leaders of former times, were accustomed to consider Louis Napoleon as the providential protector and guardian of the Church. On this uncertain and fickle die did they cast their all, giving up with alacrity and single-heartedness every principle of liberty and civic dignity which they had so long contended for with no common valour and success. It was, indeed, a melancholy sight to view the grey-haired and venerable defenders of the Church under Louis Philippe fall one after the other into the courtly snares of Louis Napoleon. The game of old times was played over once more, and with equal success. Donations and endowments were showered on the prelates, and on the *curés*, and downward on the poor indigent *vicaires*; but in the meantime the silken rope was thrown around the neck, the noose grew tighter and tighter, thanks to pettifogging ministers and lawyers, when lo! a clap of thunder pealed throughout the whole world, and the Holy Father himself sounded the trumpet of resistance to the nefarious usurpations of a Cavour, and to the still deeper designs of his Imperial protector in Paris. The year 1856 witnessed the triumph of Cavour's policy at the Congress; 1860 showed a modification in Napoleon's policy in regard to France itself; 1863 shows another turn—another *Wendepunkt*, as the Germans would say, and this decisive step may be partly ascribed to the attitude of the Catholics. The spell is broken, the charmer works no more, and the Church is probably destined either to recover her freedom, or to suffer persecution: in both cases she must be the winner.

We have just seen how thoroughly defenceless was every political party in France against the encroachments and aspiring tendencies of the Imperial Government. It is but just to add that the most distinguished men among the French Catholics were at first hardly better prepared for the impending struggle. Their spirit was worn out, their ardour damped, the fire of their energy quenched. The writer of these lines well remembers a certain day in 1859, when some among their number met at a private house to consult together as to what might be done for the Holy Father in his distress. Priests were there, eminent writers were there, deputies were there, to say nothing of a whole bevy of minor stars. After a full hour's talking, the conference ended in adopting a form of prayer for the Pope, and voting the publication of a small pamphlet intended to defend in a popular form the temporal rights of Pius IX. The meeting was about to separate, when an English Catholic, who happened to be present, ventured to put in a few words to the following purpose:—"You must allow a foreigner," said

he, "were it only on the score of English eccentricity, to make a few remarks on what has just taken place. I cannot help expressing my surprise at the meagre result of our present meeting. A short prayer, and a short pamphlet to be published by subscription—is that really all that the Catholics of Paris can do for their beloved Father? Prayers are inestimable things in their way; but action is likewise of some use. Now, here you are—the same men who fought pertinaciously during twenty years for religious freedom, and nowadays you tell us that under the present constitution nothing can be done! You will excuse my bluntness; but I say that there must be some flaw in this Constitution, into which you may insert the wedge. There are plenty of lawyers and deputies in this room: well, let them consult among themselves and give us a constitutional means of loudly protesting against the Emperor's policy in regard to Rome. It is not for me to point out how the thing is to be done; but surely you can do in Catholic France what I could do to-morrow in Protestant England."

The above simple and plain-spoken words had the singular effect of loosening every man's tongue; it was soon found out that the Senate was empowered to receive and discuss petitions, and consequently a petition was immediately drawn up, and in a few days covered with numberless signatures. The movement, once initiated, spread over all France, and the Catholics had the signal merit of being the very first to revive something like public spirit with respect to an all-important subject.

It would be needless and far from my purpose to describe in detail the agitation which marked the years 1860 and 1861. Every reader well remembers the events of that time. In December, 1859, the Emperor had written a letter to the Pope, in which he declared that the laws of inexorable logic did not allow him to bring back the Romagna to the obedience of the Holy See; and as a last resource referred Pius IX. to a congress. But just as public opinion was rallying round this new idea, a famous pamphlet, "*Le Pape et le Congrès*," burst forth on the astonished world, and all idea of a congress was blown away. And then followed in rapid succession measure after measure on the part of the Emperor, which seemed to lash as it were public opinion into a frenzy. But still the warfare relative to the Roman question took the lead. In the press the contest was kept up on both sides with a degree of vehemence and ability which recalled other times; whilst the bishops, in their pastoral charges, boldly confronted the Government doctrines, both in regard to the temporal power of the Pope and the pseudo-Gallicanism of a Rouland. The latter, though a lawyer, was, indeed, utterly discomfited and



reduced to his wits' end. The press it was an easy matter to silence, and M. Billault made good use of his weapon by suppressing the *Univers* and several other Catholic journals. It was, indeed, remarkable that M. Veuillot, the vehement and talented advocate of arbitrary power, the ardent opponent and crier-down of every free institution, should have been disarmed in a good cause through the very means which he recommended for the repression of others. But these means could not be used against the bishops, who defied them as they defied threats, and flattery, and advice, and supplications of every description. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when, after reading the Papal Encyclical, they turned to the historical dissertations of a Thouvenel, or the compendious demonstrations of a Rouland?

The reader may now begin to perceive the connection between the religious agitation of 1859 and 1860 and the Elections of 1863. The former movement prepared and rendered possible the latter; nay, more, it acted immediately and directly on the French Chambers by encouraging the able defenders of the Papal rights. Both in the Senate and in the Corps Législatif they were emboldened by the support they met with in the world at large. And then it was that a Keller, an Anatole Lemer cier, a Kolb Bernard, and many others, won their golden spurs; then it was that a Montalembert, a Prince de Broglie, a Bishop of Orleans, thundered forth their philippics in defiance of the Imperial policy; then it was, in fine, that on a division ninety-one voters were found to have given their voice against two words of the address which implied a slur on the conduct of the Holy Father. Those ninety-one members were doomed, and henceforward considered as mortal enemies of the throne; but they had made an impression on the country, and their protest was the very first lisping of Liberty endeavouring once more to recover her former accents with her former power. The French Catholics may ever be proud of having been the first to resist an autocrat whose omnipotence had hitherto met with no opposition, even from the staunchest adherents of democracy. It is now high time that we should turn our immediate attention to the elections of 1863, which will probably mark a new era in the new-fashioned parliamentary history of France.

We should certainly attribute no more than his due to Napoleon III. in believing that his keen eye had read an important lesson in the attitude of the Catholics during the two preceding years. At the rise of his erratic star above the political horizon they had been the very first to support his views and

plans, as far as they could know them. Headed by their clergy and principal leaders, they had steadily adhered to his fortunes, in 1849, 1851, and 1852. There are still people in France who remember seeing Count de Montalembert walking arm in arm with Prince Louis Napoleon; and there are others who recollect how strongly that eminent orator and his friends recommended to the votes of the Catholics their imperial *protégé*. Well, for eight long years these single-hearted bishops and simple-minded lay Catholics had persevered in the same policy, ever supporting a Government which openly professed to protect and favour religion.

All of a sudden these faithful adherents and conservative partisans drop the connection, passing successively and in a short time, from coolness and distrust to an open opposition, the effects of which are soon felt in every direction. In the press, in the House of Assembly, in the Senate, nay, even within the sanctuary, they fearlessly confront Napoleon's sovereign power. They were not to be bribed, not to be baffled by wiles, not to be daunted,—above all, not to be persecuted. Well might the Imperial mind ponder over a situation so new to him. But with that remarkable swiftness of determination, that seems to be a peculiar gift of this extraordinary man, he resolved at once to alter his line of policy. He saw—perhaps with regret—that France was no longer to be held in leading-strings. Consequently a series of measures, all more or less tending to inaugurate a freer system, were successively adopted. Thus, the Assembly was called upon to deliberate with open doors, and to vote an address to the Crown; to its great surprise, the Senate was told that it had other things to do than to repeat a perpetual *Nay*, whilst the Corps Législatif received a well-timed hint that it might sometimes vary its no less perpetual *Ayes* to every Government bill, by a spice of debate or even of modest opposition. Then came also the adoption of free-trade principles, coupled with these singular words, dropped by the Emperor himself: "My Government stands in need of publicity and control." Accordingly, an extraordinary degree of freedom was granted to the revolutionary press against the Pope; but the favours of warnings and suspensions and suppressions were still awarded—as was due indeed—to the Catholic journals. As a last measure of this kind we may mention the appointment of M. de Persigny as Minister of the Home Department. The general elections were approaching, and in the present state of affairs an unflinching tool of the Imperial will was indispensable. M. de Persigny acted as the ballast destined to steady the ship through the seething waves.

And yet the new Minister was ushered in as a harbinger of peace and freedom. Every reader will remember his first circular, in which he invited the French people to study and imitate the free institutions of Old England. Had he not himself just returned from that country, and did he not entertain the highest regard for its sound good sense, for its free Parliament and free press? Freedom! freedom! Many a bird in the French press was caught by the glue, lured by the magic of that name, and found too late that the Ministerial circulars were but a snare. Confiscation followed upon confiscation; and then came the mad measures against the Society of S. Vincent de Paul, which have contributed perhaps more than anything else to alienate Catholic hearts and votes from the Imperial Government.

But probably, according to a previous agreement between the master and his devoted servant, and whilst M. Fould was holding forth with his famous financial report, the Minister of the Interior was already busy with the future elections. As a first step, the prefects and sub-prefects were given to understand that their future promotion would depend solely upon their success in canvassing for the official candidates. On the other hand, should they succumb to an Opposition member, immediate dismissal would be the consequence. In a country like France, where a public servant has often no other pecuniary resource but Ministerial favour, such a threat acted as an incessant stimulus on the zeal of the Government agents. Above all, twenty-five deputies, who had been more or less conspicuous for their opposition on the Roman question, were placed under interdict. On no account whatsoever were they to be returned, as they must be decidedly ranked among the foremost enemies of the Imperial dynasty. Again, such men as Thiers, Montalembert, Berryer, De Falloux, Anatole Lemercier, Keller, D'Andelarre, Plichon, &c., were denounced by the Minister as hardly better than so many Catilines, who were plotting the overthrow of social order. Thus spurred on, the prefects set lustily to work. In one province, celebrated for its Napoleonic tendencies, a son of Casimir Périer, well known as an independent character, and M. de Mortemart, belonging to one of the oldest French families, stood for the deputation. A young and ambitious sub-prefect was selected to prevent *per fas et nefas* the election of the latter gentleman. For a whole year he laboured with all his might against the Opposition candidate, when, lo! the versatile Minister changed his mind, and telegraphed to his obedient agent that he must give up his opposition to M. de Mortemart. "No," replied this time the sub-prefect; "I must go on, for I should be dishonoured,

and of no use to you into the bargain." And he *did* go on, and M. de Persigny was obliged to yield to his subaltern; and, after all, M. de Mortemart lost his seat in Parliament; and most probably both Minister and agent chuckled at the thought of their sagacity. Was not M. de Mortemart among the NINETY-ONE?

But in the mean time two singular occurrences had happened, which are of sufficient importance to be taken into account. Towards the latter end of 1861, a new journal had been established under the name of *La France*, edited by the notorious De la Guéronnière. Its founders were all more or less religious men, and all to a man professed the most ardent devotion to the Imperial dynasty. Their object was to defend, in a certain degree, the Holy Father, and to advocate liberal principles in regard to government. They were opposed to M. Thouvenel's policy towards Rome, and bitterly hostile to M. de Persigny's management of the internal affairs. To overthrow the latter seems to have been their prime aim; to replace the former, one of their chief designs. Well, M. Drouyn de Lhuys, honourably known for his attachment to the Holy See, has actually superseded M. de Thouvenel, and M. Boudet has just walked into the hotel of his wayward predecessor:—

—— Faith, 'twas strange, passing strange,

that such such things should come to pass. The why and the wherefore fully deserve a few moments of our attention.

It was impossible that the growing discontent of the French Catholics and bishops should escape the Emperor's penetration. He had but to look around him among some of his most devoted adherents, and even within his own family circle, to discover that brooding feeling of opposition, sometimes the more dangerous and desperate for having to contend with rival sentiments and affections. It became equally evident that the events of the two or three last years tended to throw all these sundry elements of strife into the hands of such parties as are decidedly hostile to the present form of government. I allude, of course, to the Legitimists and Orleanists. Many of them already banded together with the great mass of Catholic opinion, to avail themselves of the opportunity, and form one compact party, under the standard of religion and liberty. A newspaper had been started for that especial purpose: its fidelity had, indeed, been tried by gold, but every one of its contributors had spurned the proffered bribe; and if an independent opponent had been silenced, still the attempted seduction had proved a failure.

Nevertheless, another attempt might be made, and perhaps with unparalleled success. Why not nip the blossom in its bud? Why not establish a journal of the same kind,—a journal assuming airs of complete independence, though secretly dependent upon the master's good will and sufferance? Supposing matters to come to the worst, it would be sowing division among the Catholics, many of whom are anything but Legitimists and Orleanists. And if they rallied round the motley group who sued for permission to publish *La France*, might they not be led on a little farther, and by degrees be weaned from their close and faithful adherence to their spiritual pastors of high or low degree? Nay more, might not some bishops be themselves won over to the spangled flag of Imperial religionism, if I may be allowed the term? Such an object was worth a trial.

And so the plan was carried into execution; and M. de la Guéronnière was placed at the head of the new publication, which was brought forth to the world, dressed up in the gold-laced swaddling-clothes of half a dozen senators. But the appointment of such a man as the writer who prided himself on the paternity of "*Le Pape et le Congrès*," which alone rendered a congress downright impossible, was in itself a blunder. M. de la Guéronnière is a man who can mould himself into every shape and form as a journalist or as a pamphleteer; ay, who can convert himself into anything, except a deep thinker or a consistent politician. He began by editing a provincial newspaper patronized by the Legitimist party; then skipped over to the *Presse*, under Emile de Girardin; then turned Republican with Lamartine; then again fenced, and parried, and fought for Louis Napoleon, who finally rewarded his chameleon-like abilities by a seat in the Senate. At Athens he would have ranked among the Sophists, who bore such bitter enmity to Socrates; in Rome he might have taught Cæsar and Cicero the art of writing; but above all he would have clung to Cæsar. His silvery tones and polished periods charm the ear; but when you come to probe the sense beneath, alas! you scarcely find anything else but—

—— Sesquipedalia verba.

To select such a man, therefore, as the leading spirit of the new undertaking, was, I repeat it, an egregious blunder. In fact, whenever M. de la Guéronnière endeavoured to lay down his principles and to state his doctrines, there was a vagueness in his articles which was felt by every reader. He only became pungent, terse, and thoroughly spirited whenever he had to

oppose, under covert terms, M. de Persigny. Indeed, his journal soon became a daily exponent of bitter hostility to the Minister, who more than once deigned to reply with his own hand in the *Constitutionnel*. Thus the quarrel became a drawn battle between M. de Persigny and M. de la Guéronnière, to the infinite amusement of the gallery, and, perhaps, of the Emperor himself.

On the whole, however, *La France* had the better of its powerful antagonist. For some secret reason unknown to the public, the journal was allowed to go to the full length of its tether, and it lost no opportunity in making the most of this advantage. The forthcoming elections were a fair ground for a hand-to-hand fight; so M. de la Guéronnière plunged headlong *in medias res*. When the semi-official organs of the Home Department treated as enemies the Opposition candidates, and reprobated in the strongest terms their election, *La France* maintained with no less energy that their opposition would become insignificant when confronted with an overwhelming majority. Besides, would not these malcontents be far more dangerous outside the Chamber than within its walls? What was the use, as the Minister had done formerly—what was the use of appealing to the generosity and best feelings of old parties, if their most eminent representatives were to be branded as outlaws and deadly foes, because they believed in the professions of the Government? Again, if such members as those who had showed a feeling of independence on the Roman question were to be held up to public execration, was not this going directly in the teeth of the Imperial declaration, that a control or a safety-valve was indispensable? Was this wisdom? Was it acting up to the express wishes of the Sovereign, who, above all, courted publicity and an honest appreciation of his measures? Was it a system of policy adapted to conciliate opposition or to propitiate enmity? As it was natural to infer from the above reasoning, *La France* ended by supporting the very men whom M. de Persigny publicly reprobated.

But this personal controversy, together with other influences of a still more important nature, operated likewise in a way which was totally unexpected by any party, and took every one by surprise. The Emperor had so often spoken of England; so often held up her institutions as a sort of model for the French people; so often talked in public, as well as in private, of the abuses of centralization; so often manifested the wish to see the policy of his Government subjected to a control, that he was at length taken at his word. Strange it was, but yet there was no denying the fact, that the lower no less than the



upper classes began to speak seriously of crowning the edifice. We are here brought to consider one of the most singular and curious features of French character, or rather of the French world, as it has been moulded and kneaded into shape by the present Government.

During the Italian war, as was noticed above, the revolutionary and infidel journals were allowed full scope to assail and malign the Catholics and their venerable Chief. All the severity of the Home Department, then governed in regard to the press by M. de la Guéronnière, was directed against religious newspapers. Three journals, the *Siècle*, the *Opinion Nationale*, and the *Presse*, were conspicuous for their bitter though vulgar hostility to the Holy See. The two former were well known to be pseudo-democrats, having one foot in the Imperial and another in the Republican camp. They all three bent their knee before Mammon, and catered to the popular prepossessions. In reality, however, they belonged, as far as they clung to any principle, to the Republican school, and consequently did their best to form a coalition to be used to some purpose in the future elections. Their readers were taught day by day to give up their own individual opinions for the sake of the common weal; the *Siècle* boasted more than once of its multitudinous public, whose name was million; well, this million was made to consider M. Havin, the chief editor of the journal, as the true representative of Democracy, notwithstanding his well-known intimacy with certain Ministers. The same with M. Guérault, of the *Opinion Nationale*; the same with the *Presse*, now edited by the notorious Emile de Girardin. At first sight, the combination of these newspapers to direct and weigh upon the elections seems absolutely ridiculous; and so it would be in England; but "they order these matters better in France," and so we must take them into serious account. The licence which the Imperial Government had given these three journals really constituted a monopoly in their favour. They used it to secure the election of such candidates—in Paris, at least—as they deemed disposed to promote their designs. The working-classes were disciplined and pledged to follow up certain directions; but of the nine Parisian members, four were already known as staunch Republicans, and had done good service during the sessions included between 1857 and 1863. They were, of course, to be supported, but on condition of admitting as candidates a Havin and a Guérault, whom at the bottom of their own hearts they despised and scorned. A sad alternative, indeed; but there was no avoiding the dilemma, and so the infamous bargain was both struck and carried into execution. I can vouch for the above fact, for I had it

from one of the parties who owed his election to the conspiracy, and who considers himself as "an honest man for a' that, and for a' that!" We may well understand the scruples of a Thiers when he was obliged to bend his neck to such a yoke. It is likewise hardly possible to imagine that the Imperial Government should have foreseen such a result when it carried favour with the revolutionist party, at the expense of every Conservative feeling and opinion in France; but—

Eumenidum veluti demens videt agmina Pentheus.

On the other hand, there is in the country a long-standing party, which has never abjured its love of freedom—never catered for popularity—never given up its heartfelt, sincere, deep adherence to religious principles and practices. The main body of this party belongs to the *bourgeoisie*, and is distinguished by those domestic and civic virtues which adorn alike the private house and the public rostrum; they it is who surround the pulpit of Notre Dame; they it is who man the ranks of the Vincentian brotherhood; they it is who fill the Government offices; they it is who instil a Christian spirit into the labouring classes. These men, young and old, are generally no friends to the revolutionists; but they are no more friends to arbitrary power and despotism. The only charge which, perhaps, might be brought against them is a certain degree of apathy and indifference in regard to their duties as citizens, being rather too prone to leave to Providence the reformation of mankind and the punishment of crime. "Hell will never prevail over the Church—*ergo*, we may wash our hands of what is going on"—such seems to be their motto. "As long as we can go to confession and communion, and visit the poor, all is for the best." Such sort of people we might imagine the *boni homines* and the *equites Romani* to have been in the time of old Cicero.

And yet these were the men who were suddenly appealed to as forming the reserve and prop of liberty. For many long years they had held aloof, hardly hoping for a future, still less expecting that they might have a share in that future. At first they hesitated and haggled for conditions, and then decided only at the very last moment. As a specimen of this class, I may name M. Dufaure, one of the most highly-respected men in France, and who lost his election at Bordeaux merely from the fact that he did not begin canvassing until the Government had taken every measure to secure victory to their own *protégé*. It is to be hoped that the French Liberal-Conservatives will, in future, profit by the lesson.

Such was the situation when the French Chambers were dis-

solved in the beginning of May, and an Imperial decree ushered in the general elections for the 31st of May and 1st of June, 1863. I have noted above the measures adopted by M. de Persigny as preparatory to that important act; I must now relate the principal episodes of the battle itself, and bring out, as well as I can, the results of these elections, especially in their bearings on the prospects of the Catholic Church.

In order that the reader may fully understand what follows, I shall first of all lay before him the chief legal details of a French election. The writ is issued twenty days before the poll, and during the intervals the candidates are at liberty to send round their circulars, publish their "professions of faith" in the local newspapers—do all but meet their constituents. Singular though it may appear to an Englishman, a stringent law does not allow in France any meeting for a political purpose of more than twenty persons; and even that must be held in private. At the very beginning of the late electoral agitation this law was practically enforced by the Government.

But bad as this system is, it might work well were its enactments made to operate with fairness and impartiality. Unfortunately it is quite the reverse. The Administration puts forth its whole strength, and employs its numerous army of agents, in favour of its own candidate and against his opponent. The prefect, the sub-prefect, the mayors, the tax collectors, the customs' officers, the village schoolmasters, down to the very policemen, are all canvassing for one particular individual. His circulars are often printed and sent round at the expense of Government, who bestows upon them the privilege of being freed from the stamp duties; the prefects travel through every city, market-town, and village of any importance, to hold forth on the exceptional merits of the Government *protégé*. M. le Préfet not only hints, but even proclaims openly, that the "Emperor's candidate," and he alone, in case of being elected, will obtain ministerial money for the repair of churches, a branch railway for the furtherance of industry, a new parish road to the next market-town, &c. Walpole himself is beaten in the art of manœuvring, and might have held down his head for very shame.

Now even this extraordinary way of proceeding might become tolerable, were the independent canvasser to enjoy the same advantages. But, on the contrary, the Government agents must all to a man become his enemies on pain of dismissal; the post-office alone (and heaven knows how it can be trusted) will take charge of his circulars, unless he prefers the very expensive mode of sending them through private messengers. Then, again, his handbills are often torn down by official emis-

saries, or he can find no printer who dares to print them ! Lately, in one of the southern departments, a candidate was obliged to stick up his own addresses ; and I am sorry to add that in the Côtes-du-Nord a venerable bishop, strongly opposed to M. de Montalembert, and following in the footsteps of Government, deprived the diocesan printer of his lordship's custom, because the unfortunate man had unwittingly ventured to publish that gentleman's circulars.

When we consider the great difficulties against which the Opposition candidate has to contend, we must feel surprised that any of them should succeed at all, rather than be astonished at the small number of those who have obtained a seat in the new Corps Législatif. Indeed, there is another and most important obstacle which we must take into account. On comparing the total number of electors who for the last ten years have been registered with those who have voted, we come to the astounding conclusion that one-fourth, and in many cases one-third, of them, have acted upon the principle of abstention. Now these abstainers, as we may call them, are numerous everywhere, and in some electoral districts may even be counted by tens of thousands ! Had these good people, most of them practical Catholics, fulfilled their duty, the balance might have been turned in favour of their opinions, and the Government obliged to adopt a different line of policy in regard to Rome. Would not such a line of conduct have proved at least quite as useful to the Holy See as to contribute faithfully to the collection of Peter's pence ?

The pleas put forward to justify this singular apathy are twofold. Many declare that it would be absolutely impossible to withstand the undue pressure of the Government on the elections ; consequently, it is far better to stand still and do nothing than to produce public proofs of one's weakness and helplessness. The noble circular of seven bishops has victoriously replied to this defence ; though it is to be feared that no eloquence—were it even that of a Bossuet or a Demosthenes—will ever rouse men who are resolved to turn a deaf ear to every remonstrance.

It is easier to understand the argument brought forward by the second class of systematic non-voters. They are all Legitimists, who pretend to obey the orders of their Sovereign, Henry V. They must have nothing to do with the Empire, or its institutions. To vote for a candidate would be virtually to acknowledge the legitimacy of the present system ; and that, of course, they cannot and never will do. Unfortunately for their argument, it is well known that the Comte de Chambord leaves his adherents at liberty to vote whenever

they deem it necessary for the interests of religion or of the country. It may well be asked also what will become of the party itself, if the Legitimists thus continue to stand aloof, and persevere in this policy of non-intervention in the internal affairs of their own fatherland. As a party, they will fast dwindle into nothingness, and become objects of universal contempt.

But it is now time to adduce some proofs of the extraordinary pressure which M. de Persigny brought to bear upon the late elections. My sources of information are both of a public and private character; but out of a large bundle of such documents I will confine myself to the principal—they will suffice for my purpose, and it will be no fault of mine if some of them provoke indignation, others perhaps a smile, on the part of an English reader.

I will begin with M. de Montalembert, who stood for his own department, and also for the Côtes-du-Nord, where a large number of influential Catholics had offered him their votes. I cannot refrain from quoting a part of his address to the electors; it gives us the measure of the man:—

You and I are old acquaintances. In the critical days of 1848, for the first time, you practised universal suffrage by calling on me to represent you. In 1849 and 1852 you again renewed our connection. You were then most rightly concerned at the perils to which social order was exposed. That order I defended according to the best of my abilities, though I never overlooked the imperious claims of the future, and of freedom. At present, it is in the name of that long absent freedom that I solicit your suffrage.

Do you wish that the Government to which you have delegated your sovereignty should enjoy an absolute omnipotence, unbounded, unfettered by any real responsibility?—No. Do you wish that Government to obtain, among your representatives, as well as among your own selves, an efficacious support in every measure tending to the glory and prosperity of France?—You do. But do you likewise wish it to be seriously controlled, criticised, and even contradicted, when it may be necessary?—You do. Well, then, if such be the case, return a member entirely independent of the Government; and if you can find no better man, return me.

I gave many a pledge under Royalty, the Republic, and the Empire. Nobody can say that I was a systematic opponent of any Government. But neither was I ever a courtier, nor a blind and dumb servant of any master.

I am still what I ever was—a Catholic and a Liberal.

I will defend Religion, but by such means as are compatible with the spirit of modern times and the liberty of all.

I wish to reconquer Freedom, but with such weapons as are conformable to justice, morality, and honour.

The Count concludes in the following manly words:—

But I have said quite enough. We know each other. You know well enough that if you return me I shall do my duty.

If you do not return me, you will cause me neither harm nor pain.

If you return me, you will give me an unmistakable proof that you are still faithful to the old and manly *franchise* of the Comtois ; and by so doing you will do no less credit to yourselves than to me.

It would seem that the best policy on the part of the Administration would have been not to oppose, but rather to favour, the re-election of a man of European celebrity, and who, in spite of what some may characterize as his occasional intemperance of language, has given unquestionable proof of sincerity, single-heartedness, and hatred of revolutionary principles. Of the latter, his address alone was a sufficient evidence. M. de Persigny, however, was of a different opinion, and his agents studiously represented M. de Montalembert as a personal enemy of the Emperor—a wild revolutionist, who speculated on the overthrow of every principle sacred in the eyes of mankind. How to reconcile these accusations either with his own character and station, or with the support given him by the whole clergy of the diocese, headed by their venerable archbishop, is somewhat difficult to understand ; but so it was, and the result proved that M. de Persigny had rightly trusted to the weakness of the *bourgeois*, and to the blind prejudices of the peasantry. The latter, indeed, were plied with an argument which appealed more directly to their material interests. The mountaineers of the Jura are celebrated for the products of their dairies, and large quantities of cheese are yearly exported from this province to different parts of the world. The reader will hardly believe that the following placard was posted up in Besançon and its immediate neighbourhood on the very day before the poll :—

ELECTORS,—If you vote for M. de Montalembert you will vote for :—

The ignorance of your children ;  
 The feudal *régime*, and all its abuses ;  
 War in Italy ;  
 Salt at five sous a pound ;  
 Cheese at thirty francs the hundredweight ;  
 Lastly, you will vote for an enemy of the Government.

(Signed)

A FEW FRIENDS OF THE RURAL POPULATION.

The above document speaks volumes ; but to appreciate it duly we must bear in mind that the friends of M. de Montalembert had not, any more than those of any other candidate, the means of counteracting its effects. No provincial paper would venture to fix its authorship on the Administration, as suspension, or even suppression, might be the consequence. Besides, a flat denial of the fact is a convenient resource, to which it is impossible to reply. In the present case these mean artifices



appear to have told upon the rural electors, for the Count was not returned.

Between the Vosges mountains and the Rhine lies a small province, celebrated for the intelligence and industry of its inhabitants. The Alsatians are likewise well known for their attachment to the Imperial dynasty. They have often suffered, as well as neighbouring Lorraine, from foreign invasion, and cling with fondness to the memory of the man who carried the French eagles victorious through all Europe. In the late Legislature, M. Keller stood for Colmar; and as he had loyally sworn allegiance to the present Government, many people expected that he would again be returned, notwithstanding his honest opposition to particular measures. Such, however, was not the opinion of M. de Persigny, who singled him out as an object of bitter enmity. Had not M. Keller, on several occasions, showed himself independent of any other consideration but conscience? *Indè ira.*

The person adopted by the Home Department as the official candidate, was formerly a prefect in an important city of southern France. There he distinguished himself by such flagrant acts of immorality, that the whole town was soon in an uproar, and the delinquent was most properly dismissed by Government. From that time down to the present day, the ex-prefect had settled in prudent obscurity on his estates in Alsace; when, all of a sudden, M. de Persigny wrote him a letter, in which he besought M. W—— to stand for the deputation in opposition to M. Keller! This Ministerial epistle was neatly copied out, and circulated by the prefect of Colmar, until it found its way into the columns of the newspapers, having been sent by M. Keller himself. This gentleman is treated by M. de Persigny as a wild fanatic, as an enemy to the Imperial institutions; above all, as a revolutionist, for this qualification seems to form the climax of Government denunciation. In my humble opinion, this system of browbeating is the shortest way to turn every honest man into a revolutionist; and woe to those Governments under whose rule such things come to pass!

If we turn from the east to the west, or to the north and south of France, we still meet with the same vexatious story of agents running about in every direction to counteract the influence of M. Lemercier, for instance, at La Rochelle, who is likewise proclaimed a Red Republican. There must be some truth in this, for was he not a member of the Council-General of the Vincentian brotherhood—that bugbear of M. de Persigny? Again, at Fougères, in Brittany, we have another reading of the famous cheese conspiracy of M. de

Montalembert; for as old Armorica is renowned for its large trade in excellent butter, the country electors are told with all the gravity becoming in officers of his Imperial Majesty, that by electing the Opposition candidate, M. de Kerdrel, they would vote the underselling of butter by so many sous a pound; and, surely enough, M. de Kerdrel lost the battle.

The crowning piece, however, of this electoral strategy on the part of the Minister has yet to come, and I am able to relate the two following incidents on the best authority. Poitiers is the seat of a Court of Appeal, and one of its members determined to stand forth as an independent candidate. As sitting on the bench, he was evidently no enemy to the ruling Government, on whom he is dependent for promotion. His only crime was that he did not advocate the system of official nominees. He was soon summoned by the Minister of Justice, M. Delangle, to give up all pretension to the deputation; and, on his refusal, his court was actually called upon to meet, and to declare that their brother judge had proved himself unworthy of the bench! The court, on assembling, naturally scouted the idea, and replied, *nem. con.*, that it was perfectly monstrous to maintain that a man committed a misdemeanour by canvassing for a seat in the Assembly.

The second incident is of a still more serious character. At Libourne, not far from Bordeaux, M. Decazes, a son of the celebrated Minister, and who has conferred numberless benefits on the south-west of France, had resolved to stand for the above city. One of his friends, enjoying great influence with the population, had volunteered to attend in person at the forthcoming election, and to use his great popularity in favour of M. Decazes. But early on the morning of May 31st this gentleman was suddenly put under arrest, and transferred to Bordeaux, where he was brought before the Procureur Impérial, on some trifling charge. M. Decazes having been informed of the fact, went at once to the Solicitor-General, and threatened a public prosecution if his friend was not immediately liberated. The release took place; but on the very next day the unfortunate gentleman was again apprehended, again brought before the officer of the Crown, and again released in the evening, with many apologies. In the mean time the poll had closed, and four or five thousand voters for M. Decazes had stayed at home, for fear of incurring the same persecution. Of course these proceedings will give rise to a protest; the election itself will probably be annulled;—but what are we to think of universal suffrage itself, when it allows such glaring acts of barefaced injustice? And if they had taken

place in Naples, what an outcry would have at once burst forth from the French and English press !

I must now bring this long paper to a close. The reader who has followed me so far has a right to inquire what I conceive will be the result of the French Elections of 1863. What will be their practical effect on the Government and the nation? What have we to expect, for evil or for good, from this pitched battle on the electoral ground? What, again, for the immediate future of the Papacy, that all-absorbing interest of every good Catholic? To answer these questions is rather a difficult problem; but still, we are in possession of certain leading facts, which may serve as a clue to guide us through the labyrinth of Napoleon's policy.

For the last four or five years France has been taught to believe and repeat that, under the Imperial Government, she was the grand deliverer of enslaved nations. Within the folds of her glorious banner were hidden the freedom and independence of the world. A good cause, with justice and humanity for its support, was sufficient to call her legions to the farthest ends of the earth. Such was the principle laid down by the Emperor himself in one of his most telling speeches; such the watchword echoed by a thousand Ministerial journals, and repeated by the humblest cottier in the empire. We have not here to investigate how far, or in what manner, this grand sentiment has been carried into execution; our duty is merely to mark its effects upon the French people. With their usual intelligence and vigorous power of logic, they soon began to put the following awkward questions:—

“Why should Italy enjoy a free government and free institutions, whilst we are fettered and bound by a despotic form of government, though tolerably mild in its practical application? Are we below the Italians, whom we have helped to recover their independence?”

“Again, are we below the Austrians, whom we have so signally defeated and humbled to the dust? They are already retrieving their losses—recovering from their state of permanent bankruptcy, controlling their Government through a free parliament, a free constitution, a free press, which your official and semi-official newspapers are constantly lauding—are we unworthy of the same boon? Why not at length try the same method with ourselves?”

“Do we rank below the Anglo-Saxons, below the Americans, below the Prussians, below the Bavarians? Are we less civilized than they? less intelligent? less Christian?”

“Why confine your reforms to free trade, or to a certain

freedom of speech granted to our deputies and senators? These are all very well as the first instalments of liberty; but is it not high time to go farther, to add the crowning piece to your constitution, as you so formally promised when you ascended the throne? Your power is boundless, your enemies are prostrate, your Government the strongest in the world. Then what are you waiting for? Above all, why persist in a system of official candidates, who in reality are mock representatives of a mock parliament, and whose mode of election is a slur cast upon the national honour and dignity?"

Such are the questions which, of late, have been constantly discussed among the middle class throughout all France; sometimes in the form of inaudible murmurs, like the moanings of the rising wind; at others breaking forth in bolder tones, which the warnings of the Home Department could scarcely for a moment repress. The late elections, in particular, have spoken in no mistakable language the signs of the times; for it is a striking fact that in most of the French towns and cities the Opposition candidates would have won the victory, had it not been for the rural voters of the surrounding district, who had been purposely massed up with the city population, in order to secure the return of the Government *protégés*.

Doubtless the wild and insane policy of De Persigny in his late electoral campaign has done much to produce this result; but those who are not content to consider merely the surface of things, and who endeavour to catch at least a glimpse of undercurrents, will bear me out in my opinion that France is undergoing a social transformation, totally independent of any particular statesman or any political party. The French, with their ready wit, have nicknamed Persigny a Persignac, to signify his resemblance with Prince de Polignac; but were there no Persignac, the situation would just be the same. Men grow weary of being kept in leading-strings when they feel that they have strength, not only to walk, but to run alone.

Now, Napoleon is certainly the last man to misunderstand these evident manifestations of public opinion. His keen eye is watchful of every event, his sensitive ear alive to every sound arising out of the bosom of the nation, which for the last ten years he has been leading on to become the umpire of Europe. He has already given pledges of his disposition to yield with good grace what he cannot withhold much longer; and thus I believe that I am justified in affirming that ere long France will obtain a larger share of real constitutional government. We have probably seen the last of official nominees; and the appointment of new Ministers, who are in no way statesmen or politicians, may perhaps be accepted as the harbinger of more

important reforms. The intention of effecting such reforms may indeed be denied at present ; but was not the appropriation of Savoy and Nice most emphatically denied at the very time when Napoleon and Cavour were drawing up together the secret compact at Plombières ?

Such is my first conclusion. The second, grounded on the first, is no less important, though I am not aware that attention has been drawn to it either in France or England. The generation which was yet at school in 1848 has risen to manhood, and is full of all the yearnings and aspirations of youth. The men of this generation have a longing for liberty, but for a liberty *sui generis*, and perhaps very different, as to its outward forms and trappings, from that ideal which their fathers worshipped. In their eyes a free constitution, coupled with an Imperial Government, and even grafted upon a somewhat despotic system of centralization, is by no means an impossibility. "We wish for liberty," says many a well-meaning Frenchman, "but we require a strong hand to rule and curb us." At any rate, there is a multitude of young men who, though they style themselves Liberals, are now striving to have a share in the management of public affairs, and consequently to take the place of those who now fill the Government offices. Now, the latter do not seem aware of this fact ; they admit of no other social or political status but that to which they have become accustomed, and which they have learned fondly to associate with their past labours and triumphs. On conversing with certain eminent statesmen of those times, one is frequently reminded of the lines in which Horace represents old age as

Difficilis, querulus, laudator temporis acti  
Se puero, censor castigatorque minorum.

It would certainly be better for France if the young and the old were to combine the well-earned experience of the one with the hot-blooded fervour of the other, for the good of their common country. But come what may, every close observer may already see the elements of an intelligent, active, high-principled party, which may become either his Majesty's Opposition, or his Majesty's Government, or perhaps each by turns. I am well pleased to be able to add, that many a good Catholic is to be found in their ranks.

And this brings us at once to the actual situation of the Church in France, and to the influence which the Elections of 1863 may have on the policy of the Imperial Government in regard to the Holy See. If any one thing took people by surprise, it was the pastoral charge of seven Bishops, all belonging, it was said, to different political opinions, and yet

all united in urging upon the French Catholics not to swerve from their duty as electors. It was an unheard-of incident, and, as such, hailed as a godsend by the many, or condemned as the token of a factious spirit by the few hangers-on of De Persigny's administration. For those who, like myself, are calm spectators of the scenes, the act is simply a proof of the change which has been gradually effected in the minds of the French clergy. But a very short time ago they were upbraided with clinging servilely to the Imperial favour, on condition of receiving in return showers of material benefits, in the form of money for their churches, donations for their charities, or seats in the Senate for their Cardinals and Archbishops. The glorious protestation of the French prelates and priests at Rome, in June, 1862, has disposed of these idle assumptions, and the late manifesto of the seven Bishops has furnished another proof of their energy and disinterestedness wherever they feel religion is concerned. It was a mortal blow dealt against Erastianism in every form. Many a battle may yet be fought, but the issue is evident. The French clergy are awakening to the importance of taking their stand on the firm ground of Liberty. Henceforward both they and their flocks will adhere more and more to the leading principles of free institutions, and press upon the Government the necessity of abandoning the arbitrary practice of the old *régime*, as well as the still more despotic tendencies of the half-infidel bureaucracy of the present age.

But if such is the case, it stands to reason that the Pope in Rome may rely upon a body of defenders in France, which has not its equal throughout the world. Outside the Chambers, and within the Chambers—among the laity, and among the priests—in the press, and outside of the press—will be gradually formed a party steadfastly and consistently supporting the Holy See, and forcing the Government itself to come to terms, should it ever forget its own real interests, and carry into execution the wild plans of the revolutionary party. If the Elections of 1863 produce no other but this single result, still they might be ranked among the most fortunate events of this year, in spite of all their failures and shortcomings.

A few words more, and I have done. Hitherto the ballot and universal suffrage have been used in France exclusively in the cause of anarchy or despotism. In the hands of both, it is certainly a most powerful engine, and people begin to be alarmed at the results it may bring about. By a strong and unscrupulous Government the result of the elections may be made to depend on the most ignorant and fanatic part of the population, who return invariably such men as are agreeable to the Administration. Under such a system, principle,



conscience, and honour are utterly out of the question ; in time, indeed, we might see millions of electors returning men selected for their servility and their readiness to vote according to their own private interest.

On the other hand, the influence of secret societies and revolutionary doctrines is well nigh paramount among the working classes of the towns and cities. During the late elections in Paris, the agents of these societies are known to have utterly changed the dispositions of 2000 workmen in one single night, and made them vote for M. Guérault, the Revolutionist, although they had promised their support to a Conservative. Such combinations and coalitions are certainly alarming for the social fabric ; they constitute a mobocracy, which might easily lord it over the most intelligent and most moral part of the nation. As to a representation of interests and classes, there would be none ; the very possibility of such a state of things is in itself a danger. There is nothing, therefore, astonishing in the fact, that many thinking minds are even now endeavouring to discover some remedy by which universal suffrage might be regulated so as to counteract this twofold peril of despotism and anarchy, inseparable from the electoral system in its present form. The problem is doubtless well worth the meditations of a statesman ; and the very fact of its existence deserved at least to be noticed in an article on the French Elections of 1863.

Δ.

---

## Notices of Books.

---

*Juris Ecclesiastici Publici Institutiones.* Auctore CAROLO TARQUINI, S. J.,  
Juris Canonici Professore in Collegio Romano ejusdem Societatis.

THIS work did not come to hand till we had sent to press the third article of our present number, or it would have received prominent notice therein. In that article we maintained that, so far from the promotion of spiritual good being external to the civil ruler's province, on the contrary, he acts more laudably in proportion as he more effectively directs his temporal administration to its attainment. We added, however, that (unless he be in invincible ignorance of the Church's divine appointment) he is bound, in all his efforts for spiritual good, to conduct himself with constant subordination and submission to her supreme authority. The following extract (which is but part of a long passage to the same effect) will show how earnestly Father Tarquini maintains the same doctrine; and we have particular pleasure in adducing such high Roman sanction for our statement:—

“ . . . So S. Gregory to the Emperor Maurice. ‘For this end has power over all men been given from Heaven to our pious princes (dominorum nostrorum pietati), that they who seek good things may be assisted; that the way of Heaven may be more widely opened; that the *earthly kingdom may be subject* (famuletur) to the *heavenly*.’ The same thing is said by Pope Celestine, by S. Isidore of Pelusium, by Ferrandus, and S. Bernard. Wherefore the scholastic doctors have taught that *the chief end of civil government* consists in this, that man may be trained to virtue, and thus to the obedience of religion. Among which doctors it may suffice to mention the author ‘*De Regimine Principum*,’ where he says—‘But the end at which the king should *principally aim*, in himself and in his subjects, is *eternal beatitude, which consists in the vision of God*.’

“The second part [of my statement] is thus proved: viz., that princes ought in such sense to protect religion, as not to anticipate (antevertant) but to follow the judgments of the Church; nay and not to exceed the measure, which the Church herself may have prescribed in order to the salvation of souls.

“This is proved by reason. There is a twofold reason, for which princes are bound (tenentur) to protect religion. One is less perfect, viz., that they may protect temporal felicity, which cannot long continue without probity of morals and religious worship. The other reason is more noble, and in order the chief; namely, because that temporal felicity, the care of which appertains to them, should be the felicity *appropriate to man*, and therefore *directed to eternal life* as to its end (hominis propria esse debet adeoque ordinata ad vitam eternam). But both these reasons require that princes, in defending religion, should not anticipate but follow the Church's judgments” (n. 60).

Nothing can be more admirably thought and expressed than this. But in a later passage he pronounces himself even more unmistakably. "Civil society," he says, "ought not to care for temporal felicity absolutely and simply, but only so far as it subserves man's ultimate end, that is, spiritual good. From whence it is evident that civil society by no means acts in opposition to its proper duty, when it grants something to the Church *which in some degree may hinder temporal felicity*" (n. 77). Thus, according to our author, the civil governor is not going beyond his legitimate function, even when, instead of aiming exclusively at his people's temporal felicity, he deliberately sacrifices some degree thereof to a higher good.

Such then is the view, taken in this work, of the civil governor's province: it is not his business simply to promote the people's temporal felicity, but to promote it only in that degree and direction which may be most conducive to their eternal interests. This view we regard as undeniably the true one; and we see at once that it removes all *theoretical* difficulty, as to imaginable conflicts between Church and State, wherever the State is sincerely Catholic.

In these days of revolutionism and secularity, we think there is hardly any doctrine which it is more important to enforce and vindicate than this of the State's religious office; and we are very desirous, therefore, that it shall be expressed with all attainable accuracy and precision. We are induced on that account (at the risk of appearing hypercritical) to mention one or two subordinate statements of Father Tarquini on this subject, which do not at first reading strike us as altogether satisfactory. Nothing is more probable (we are well aware) than that our criticism may be based on some misconception of his full and exact meaning. And in fact there is no result of our remarks which we should hail with so much pleasure, as our obtaining a fuller elucidation of his views; and our being thus enabled to follow his teaching no less unreservedly in his minor and subordinate opinions, than we do already in his broad and general principles.

The chief difficulty presented to ourselves by his theory on the functions of civil society may be thus drawn out: "Civil society," says Father Tarquini, as already quoted, "should not care for temporal felicity absolutely and simply, but only so far as it may be subservient to spiritual good." If this be so, surely the ultimate and adequate end of civil society would appear to be, not temporal good, but spiritual" (n. 2). But he has already laid down (n. 7) that the nature or essence of societies is determined only by their adequate end. We confess ourselves unable to see, under these circumstances, how the author has given us means for accurately distinguishing between the respective essences of ecclesiastical and civil society. We need not of course say that, in common with Father Tarquini and all Catholics, we hold the distinction between these two societies to be most signal. But it seems to us that this distinction is based on considerations which the author has not indeed denied, but which he has failed to express with due prominence and clearness. We proceed to explain our meaning.

Father Tarquini has expressly adverted to the contrast which exists between a "necessary" and a "voluntary" society (see note to n. 27), the former of course being one with which God commands us to be united. Now,

in n. 6 the author seems to express himself as though "the end" of a necessary society, no less than of a voluntary one, signified some "fixed and common end" which all its members (as such) pursue. But such a notion would surely lead to much confusion of thought. There is no ground whatever for the supposition that there is some "fixed and common end" which all members of civil society, as such, pursue. And most certainly, if there were, it would not be the end which Father Tarquini himself assigns to civil society; viz., that special kind and degree of temporal felicity which is most conducive to their spiritual welfare. By the "end" of civil society we should surely understand, not "the end in fact desired by its various members," but "the end marked out for it by God—its author."

This being understood, we should further say that the end of civil society, or (as we prefer expressing it) of civil government, is twofold,—primary and secondary. By its *primary* end we understand that end for which God directly instituted it; that end which He directly contemplated (if we may so speak) in its establishment. By its *secondary* ends we understand those various other ends which God also desires the civil governor (as such) to pursue. It is plain, moreover, that the various powers and privileges appertaining to civil government are to be understood by a reference to its *primary* end; since they are, in fact, the means placed in its hands by God for accomplishing that purpose which He designed in its establishment.

Now the primary end of civil government is either *immediate* or *ultimate*. As to its immediate primary end, we hold that this consists, neither in the promotion of spiritual good, nor even of temporal felicity in any large or full acceptance of that term; but only of exterior peace, or, as we more commonly express it in English, protection of person and property. Now it is quite impossible that exterior peace can be preserved unless there be some supreme authority having at command physical strength which is practically irresistible: God, therefore, has invested the civil governor with the rightful authority of enforcing his just commands by the employment of such physical strength. Again, it is impossible that exterior peace can be duly preserved without capital punishment: God has, therefore, given the civil governor authority to inflict such punishment. And so in regard to all the various powers conferred by God on the civil government. On the other hand, it is not at all necessary for the preservation of exterior peace, that the civil governor should possess any special and exceptional enlightenment in moral and spiritual truth: God, therefore, has not given it. Such, then, is the primary end of civil government. Its *immediate* primary end is the preservation of exterior peace; its *ultimate* primary end is the attainment of those inestimable benefits, both spiritual and temporal, which flow from exterior peace. Its powers and gifts are all those, and only those, which fit it for the maintaining of exterior peace.

We see, then, at once the broad and ineffaceable distinction between ecclesiastical and civil society. The immediate primary end of civil society is purely temporal; and God has given to it no other gifts or powers except those requisite for a temporal end. But the Church's immediate primary end is purely spiritual; viz., the sanctification of souls (see Tarquini, n. 4): and God has invested her with those gifts and powers which are requisite for so

high a mission. He has invested her, *e.g.*, with the gift of infallibly teaching dogma and morals; with the gift of supernatural prudence in adapting means to her great end; with the power of directly moral and religious legislation; and with those other very numerous gifts and powers which we need not here pause to recount.

But all this is not in the slightest degree inconsistent with our proposition, that civil government has *secondary* ends also; and it has been our main purpose, in the third article of our present number, to show on grounds of reason what *are* those secondary ends. The ruler's primary duty no doubt is the preserving of exterior peace; and to this he is strictly obliged. Nor can the performance of this duty in itself (as distinct from any faulty *means* which he may adopt for the purpose) clash by possibility with higher ends; for there is no other way in which he can so efficaciously promote spiritual or temporal good as by its exact fulfilment. But we maintain further, that he acts more acceptably to God in proportion as he goes beyond the strict obligation; in proportion as he devotes the various powers with which he is intrusted, to his people's general good, both spiritual and temporal. Here, however, a vitally important distinction must be most carefully observed. So far as he labours for those kinds of temporal good which are independent of spiritual,—*e.g.*, so far as he enforces laws in regard to free trade, or currency, or railway extension, or postal facilities,—he is rightly guided in the last resort by his own judgment. But the case is widely different, so far as he pursues moral and spiritual good. This, indeed, though but a *secondary* end of civil government in the sense above explained, yet is his highest and most admirable function of all. But in its exercise he is no longer supreme; for he has entered on that province within which the Church possesses sovereign authority. Here, then, is the civil ruler's highest office and privilege—to offer his temporal authority at the Church's feet, and labour, subordinately to her guidance, in co-operating with her to her primary end. We have already quoted Father Tarquini's statement to this precise effect.

And such (if we may trust learned men) would seem to be the Fathers' universal teaching. "It is their unanimous doctrine," says our author (n. 54), "that the . . . government of civil society should be subject to the Church, just as the body is subject to the soul." They are constantly saying, indeed, that temporal felicity is the end of civil society; and a certain modern school of thought has understood them to mean thereby that the civil ruler transgresses his province in pursuing spiritual good. But so far are they from meaning this, that their one object is earnestly and emphatically to declare the exact contrary. Our author has brought together some of their most characteristic dicta in n. 54; and any one who reads them with any attention will confirm our remark. We cannot better explain the drift of these dicta than by supposing one of these holy men to address a temporal prince. "The sphere within which you are supreme," he would say, "is exclusively temporal. But it is self-evident, and you do not think of denying it, that you should, in your whole administration, preserve the temporal in its due subordination to the spiritual; while in the spiritual order you cannot profess to be supreme. It follows, that in all your highest acts of government you should submit yourselves to the Church's teaching and admonition."

We are far from saying that this analysis exhausts the full meaning of such patristic testimonies as Father Tarquini has accumulated ; but only that it is true so far as it goes. They may undoubtedly, without any violence, be understood to imply a doctrine on the Church's indirect temporal power, closely resembling that drawn out in later ages by Suarez and Bellarmine. But, in the article to which we have so often referred, we avowedly abstain from all discussion of this question ; and we will here also abstain from such discussion.

We have dwelt so long on the relations between Church and State, because it so happens that we have considered that question at length in our present number. But it must not be supposed that the present work refers at all exclusively to that theme. On the contrary, it covers the whole subject of *Jus Ecclesiasticum Publicum*. On almost every particular, except the few subordinate statements which we have already ventured to criticise, we have only to express our unqualified admiration of Father Tarquini's labours. It is indeed most refreshing in these northern latitudes to be visited by the genial atmosphere of Rome ; and it is quite a treat to follow step by step the simple and straightforward reasoning whereby our author traces out the full extent of ecclesiastical and papal jurisdiction, which is really involved in the most elementary principles of Catholicism. We observe with particular pleasure the terms in which he speaks of the famous Gallican Declaration. He by no means treats its propositions as those which a good Catholic is at liberty to hold ; but, on the contrary, he comments on them just as he comments on Richer's and Febronius's intolerable extravagances. He speaks of all three systems as "opposed to the true constitution of the Church" (lib. ii. n. 11), and as "erroneous" (n. 22). And we commend to particular notice his summary account of the Church's true constitution (lib. ii. n. 3), which for clearness and completeness cannot be exceeded.

Good comes out of evil. It is one advantage resulting from that opposition to the Church's authority which now seems setting in from so many professedly Catholic quarters, that the Church's loyal children are led, by the study of such works as this, to contemplate more steadily, and thus to perceive more adequately, the full extent of her august prerogatives.

---

*Tractatus de Ecclesiâ Christi.* Auctore PATRICIO MURRAY, in Collegio Sancti Patricii, apud Maynooth in Hiberniâ, Sacre Theologie Professore. Dublin : McGlashan & Gill.

THIS most important and valuable work has already covered considerable ground : it has treated the Church's indefectibility, visibility, unity, and sanctity, and has also discussed the Protestant rule of faith. The remaining subjects promised by Dr. Murray are such as these : the Catholic Rule of Faith ; Authority of the governing Church ; the Object-matter of the Church's Authority, whether as teaching or governing ; the Head of the Church ; the Notes of the Church, &c.



We cannot but regard it as one of the most important scientific theological treatises written by a Catholic\* in these islands for the last three centuries. It supplies a want not in British only, but in European, or rather Ecumenical Catholic theology. It is well known that S. Thomas and the scholastics who follow his arrangement have devoted far less space to the "*De Ecclesiâ*" and kindred subjects than corresponds even to their intrinsic importance; for surely the political and social organization of Christianity is an extremely important part of theological science on its own ground. But in these days the doctrines in question have assumed peculiar interest. The very first principles of belief are now everywhere called into question; and it is a matter of great moment that (not clerics only but) educated laymen shall be thoroughly instructed in the argumentative ground on which our faith rests. This has, indeed, been emphatically urged by Dr. Murray himself in various parts of his "*Annual Miscellany*," and will be generally admitted. But the argumentative foundation of our faith is indissolubly bound up with the doctrine "*De Ecclesiâ*," and cannot by possibility be treated apart from that doctrine.

We defer, of course, our direct comment on this work until its completion. Here we will but express our warm admiration of the way in which Dr. Murray has executed his task, so far as it has advanced. To say that on one or two open questions we are not entirely in accord with it, is merely to say that no Catholic will precisely agree with any other on every open point. But such small differences of opinion in no way affect the feelings of admiration which we have just expressed. Three characteristics are particularly worthy of notice. (1) The clearness and definiteness with which Dr. Murray has thought out the various doctrines which he enunciates. He never takes refuge in vague generalities to save himself the trouble of coming to a clear and distinct view; but in each case places a precise and definite thought first before his own mind, and then before that of others. (2) His Scriptural quotations are not confined to the citation of individual passages, which may or may not be precisely relevant. He carefully examines each in its context; and not unfrequently takes very great pains, and argues at considerable length, to show without doubt that the passage is really to his purpose. (3) He takes singular pains to understand Protestant objections from the Protestant point of view. In the case of many Catholic controversialists, we are far more confident that their direct arguments are solid and cogent than we are that they rightly understand their opponent's standpoint. But the most prejudiced Protestants can hardly think this of Dr. Murray; and he has prepared himself for his task by the careful study of a large number of the most important Protestant works.

We sincerely hope that Dr. Murray will be enabled to proceed with his labours, and bring them rapidly to a conclusion.

---

\* Father Newman's "*Essay on Development*," it will be remembered, was not written by him when he was a Catholic, though its publication took place after his conversion.

*The Minor Prophets.* With a Commentary explanatory and practical, and Introductions to the several Books. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. Parts I.—III. (From Hosea to Micah, ch. i.) Oxford, Cambridge, and London.

THE pages before us are the first instalment towards the completion of a scheme which was much talked of in Oxford many years ago, but which seems to have lain dormant till quite lately. Dr. Pusey and his friends proposed to put together a commentary on the whole Bible, which should supply the want urgently felt of something more satisfactory than the long-established quartos of D'Oyley and Mant. Different books were to be entrusted to different writers, and in this way it was intended to produce the whole commentary within a comparatively short space of time. Various causes have delayed the accomplishment of the plan ; but, if we may judge from the specimen before us, its completion will enrich the literature of the Anglican Establishment with a very valuable work. It is probably by far the best plan to divide the labour, not only to save time, but for the more important reason, that no single student can well hope to deal satisfactorily with more than one or two of the great portions of Scripture, and, except in the case of books so short as those of the Minor Prophets, with more than a few of the sacred writers. The best commentaries in all languages have been partial ones : it is only from the great convenience of having a complete work that A. Lapeire and Calmet rank so high, though the judgment of the former is remarkably sound everywhere, and his instincts thoroughly religious and Catholic. But few portions of this or any general commentary can be compared with the monographs of Toletus, Pererius, or Agellius, or with the works of Ribera on the Minor Prophets, or Justiniani on the Epistles of St. Paul. It remains, of course, to be seen of what calibre the writers are to be who are to undertake individual portions of the Commentary of which Dr. Pusey is, we suppose, the general editor. It is not likely that either Oxford or the Anglican Establishment will produce men so fit to undertake any other portion of Sacred Scripture as Dr. Pusey himself for the part that he has chosen—the Minor Prophets, and perhaps Isaiah.

The Commentary will be voluminous, if other departments of it preserve the same relative proportion between text and annotation as that before us. The twelve Prophets will hardly be included in less than a quarto of 800 pages. It should be remembered, also, that it is meant for practical use, rather than to supply all the requirements of the student and the critic. Dr. Pusey gives us the result of his own researches and learning ; but he does not often give the process by which the result has been attained. This in such a commentary is, perhaps, a gain ; but we cannot help sometimes wishing that a writer who has spent so many years in the study of Hebrew, and of all that can bear on the Old Testament, should give us rather more criticism than he does. At the same time, it is a relief to be spared the long catalogues of names and authorities for different opinions which take up so large a space in some commentaries on the Bible. We do not *always* want the whole history of opinion on a passage. It is almost a relief to think that biblical literature is becoming so multitudinous, that writers are obliged to

spare us this parade of authorities, lest it should leave them no room for their own remarks. Dr. Pusey's commentary flows on thus without much interruption or discussion, though there are peculiarities about his style which amount to as specific a mannerism as any that is to be found among Methodist or Evangelical writers, and which may sometimes even puzzle a reader not previously acquainted with his writings.

It is interesting to have the opinion of one so well fitted to judge on the use that has been made of late of the cognate Semitic languages for illustration of the meanings of Hebrew words. Of course, no scholar of Dr. Pusey's eminence would question the value of such illustration: still the principle itself may be pushed too far. It was said not long ago, for instance, that a Hebrew scholar without a knowledge of the cognate languages was no better off than a Greek scholar who had read nothing but Ionic or Doric Greek. But the principle is one thing, and the use made of it another. Let us hear what Dr. Pusey says—he is speaking of the translators of the Anglican Bible: "They had most of the helps for understanding Hebrew which we have—the same traditional knowledge from the ancient versions, Jewish commentators, or lexicographers, or grammarians, with the exception of the Jewish-Arabic school only, as well as the study of the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, and they used these aids with more mature and even judgment than has mostly been employed in the subsequent period. Hebrew criticism has now escaped, for the most part, from the arbitrariness which detected a various reading in any variation of a single old version, or in the error of some small fraction of MSS., which disfigured the commentaries of Lowth, Newcome, and Blayney. But the comparison of the cognate dialects opened for the time an unlimited licence of innovation. Every principle of interpretation, every rule of language was violated. The Bible was misinterpreted with a wild recklessness to which no other book was ever subjected. A subordinate meaning of some half-understood Arabic word was always at hand to remove whatever any one disliked. Now, the manifoldness of this reign of misrule has subsided. But interpretations as arbitrary as any that have perished still hold their sway, or from time to time emerge; and any revisal of the authorized version of the Old Testament, until the precarious use of the dialects shall be far more settled, would give us chaff for wheat, introducing an indefinite amount of error into the Word of God."—(Intro. pp. vii. viii.)

Although the method adopted in the commentary itself keeps down to a great extent any display of erudition, the references as well as the introductions to the several Prophets evince immense and conscientious research. Every kind of illustration—historical, physical, geographical; and scientific—is at hand. The introductions themselves are extremely valuable. We may notice, in particular, one feature that at the present moment has a peculiar interest of its own: we mean the attention drawn by Dr. Pusey to the fact, that the Prophets he illustrates use in a thousand places language and imagery drawn from the Pentateuch. This fact indubitably proves not only their own every-day use of the earlier portions of the Bible, but that those to whom they prophesied—princes and people, whether in the kingdom of Israel or of Judah—had the contents of the books of Moses "familiar to their ears as household words."

*De Prisca Refutatione Hæreseon, Origenis nomine ac Philosophoumenon titulo recens vulgata, Commentarius TORQUATI ARMELLINI, e Societate Jesu. Romæ: Typis Civiltatis Cattolicæ. 1862.*

**T**HIS dissertation proposes to add another name to the list of candidates for the authorship of the celebrated "Philosophoumena." Padre Armellini thinks he can make out a good claim for the schismatic Novatian.

No hypothesis hitherto offered has completely satisfied the critical world. Origen at present has few supporters. The warmest advocates for Tertullian allow that grave objections can be alleged against his claim. The more generally received opinion which attributes the work to Hippolytus rests on a number of assumptions, grounded on no sufficient foundation. On the other hand, the merits of the work, the prominent fact of the author's connection with Rome, his own assertion of his high ecclesiastical rank, his antagonism to the Popes, and his schismatical leanings, forbid the abandonment of the inquiry. Does not Novatian unite in his person the several characteristics which we gather from the pages of the "Philosophoumena" for the identification of the writer? Or does the work furnish any intrinsic evidence which compels us to exclude his name?

A preliminary difficulty is presented by the chronology. Döllinger and the generality of those who have written on the subject take it for granted that the author of the "Philosophoumena" belongs to the earlier portion of the third century. The history of Novatian cannot be traced with certainty; the dates, such as they are, would oblige us to extend the lifetime of the author beyond the middle of the third century. Padre Armellini remarks that the latest heretic whose name occurs in the "Philosophoumena" is Alcibiades of Apamea in Syria. We meet with the same name in Theodoret, and from him we learn that Origen wrote against Alcibiades; Eusebius, in his account of Origen's labours, unhesitatingly fixes the date of the revival of the sect of the Helcesaitæ by Alcibiades in the interval A.D. 246-9. The composition of the "Philosophoumena" must therefore be placed after the middle of the third century. The earliest limit can only be guessed at; the heretic Prepo, a disciple of Marcion, is mentioned as writing against Bardesanes "nostris hisce temporibus:" from the fact that Prepo's name nowhere appears in the writings of Rhodo or Tertullian, we infer that Prepo wrote subsequently to the death of Bardesanes, which Theodoret places near the year 180. These dates, Padre Armellini contends, may easily be reconciled with the hypothesis of Novatian being the author of the "Philosophoumena."

Suppose that Novatian was born about the year 180; that he fell ill towards 215; received baptism when in danger of death, and was ordained priest shortly after;—this will allow of his occupying a position of influence during the reign of Pope Zephyrinus; he may easily survive to become the author of the wretched schism of 251, and even suffer a violent death during the persecution of Valerian, 253—268, assuming the correctness of the suspected account given by Socrates (H. E., l. iv. c. 28). The "Philosophoumena" will thus fall within the second half of the third century, and

the attitude of its author during the second phase of the Sabellian heresy will become intelligible.

Antiquity can furnish little external evidence for Novatian's claim : no work in any way corresponding to the "*Philosophoumena*" appears in the list of Novatian's writings ; neither is there trace of the other treatises which the author of the "*Philosophoumena*" says he had given to the world. On the other hand, S. Jerome mentions expressly that Novatian wrote "*multa alia*," in addition to the books the names of which are preserved. His fall from unity would condemn his works to obscurity ; and the loss of a treatise on heresies, composed in Greek at Rome, at a time when the knowledge of that language was on the decline, need not excite much surprise : possibly, the work was not published till after the death of Novatian, and then its circulation would naturally have been confined to his own followers.

Assuming Novatian's authorship, many valuable arguments may be drawn from the work in support of the hypothesis. The writer displays an erudition such as we find attributed to Novatian ; above all, he is familiar with the Gentile philosophy, and Novatian was reproached for the preference he avowed for its study : nay, some of his opponents attributed his rigourism to the principles he had borrowed from the Stoics. The methodical arrangement and the perspicuous style of the "*Philosophoumena*" also correspond with what we should expect from the schismatical leader. Sympathy with Tertullian, fondness for his writings, the employment of his arguments, points frequently objected to by the Novatians, may be traced in the "*Philosophoumena*." The use of the Greek language will not appear singular, if we remember that Novatian was deeply imbued with Greek philosophy, and that Latin writers of the same date are known to have composed works in Greek. Tertullian, as we learn from his own testimony, had composed two works in Greek. More serious is the objection drawn from the style of the "*Philosophoumena*." Novatian wrote in a turgid, grandiose style : it cannot be said of the "*Philosophoumena*" that they are chargeable with this defect ; but the nature of the subject may account for the more subdued tone, the rather as the use of a strange language might be expected to check the flow of a writer's eloquence.

Again, how obviously the condition of the ἀρχιερεία, the high priesthood, so pompously claimed by the writer of the "*Philosophoumena*," finds its fulfilment in Novatian ! The work, we have seen, must not be placed before the middle of the third century : Novatian appears as Antipope, most probably in 251. And be it remarked that this very distinctive condition, in one who evidently was outside of the school of Callixtus,—i.e., the Catholic Church,—but who never claims his dignity during the reign of Callixtus, cannot with any appearance of probability be explained in the case of the other alleged authors of the "*Philosophoumena*."

The personal antipathy indulged in against the saintly Callixtus by the writer of the treatise in question admits of a plausible explanation in the case of Novatian. For Novatian, we conjecture, was ordained priest during the reign of Pope Zephyrinus : from the letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch we learn that he was baptized when in danger of death, and that his ordination was opposed by the clergy and the people on the ground of

the irregularity which at that time attached to clinical baptism. Now, Callixtus was archdeacon under Pope Zephyrinus, and the duty of remonstrating against Novatian as a candidate for holy orders would devolve upon him. In a temper like Novatian's that remonstrance could not fail to awake a feeling of deep resentment and personal animosity, which the death of its object was not likely to remove, especially when the dignity of the Papacy had added fuel to the original cause of pique.

The rigourism of the author of the "*Philosophoumena*," the blame he attaches to Callixtus for extending the benefits of reconciliation to all sinners, his anxiety to refuse this grace to fallen bishops, constitute a further remembrance with Novatian. Indeed, the very arguments attributed in the "*Philosophoumena*" to Pope Callixtus identically re-appear in the treatises composed by S. Pacian against Novatian. In the ninth book there occurs a doubtful passage, from which, taken in conjunction with the context, we may gather that the writer condemned second marriages. From Theodoret we learn that at first they were not censured by Novatian; but it may be inferred that his ideas became more narrowed as he advanced; and it is beyond doubt that the eighth canon of the Council of Nice required from the Novatian converts to the Church a promise to hold communion with persons who had entered the marriage state a second time.

Of all the writings of Novatian we possess only two letters and a treatise on the Trinity. The author of the "*Philosophoumena*" states his belief on this mystery at some length, and a comparison of their doctrine and theology regarding the Trinity will always be a crucial test of the soundness of Padre Armellini's theory. At the outset we are met by the avowal of the author that he went to such lengths in opposing Sabellius, that he was reproached by Callixtus as a ditheist: whereas the orthodoxy of Novatian on this point of belief is supposed to have been settled by the labours of Maran and Bull. Padre Armellini, however, contends that the real belief of the writer of the "*Philosophoumena*" will be placed beyond a doubt if we turn from the language employed against Pope Callixtus—language prompted perhaps by warmth of controversy,—and consider his calmer professions. It is certain that he unreservedly condemns the tritheism of the Peratæ, and declares his belief that God is one; it is certain that he recognizes the consubstantiality of the Son; he acknowledges that "God begotten of the Father" "took flesh in the womb of the Virgin." This doubt regarding the orthodoxy of the writer removed, a striking parallelism is drawn between "*Novatian de Trinitate*," c. 27, and "*Philosophoumena*," l. xvi. c. 3; "*Novatian*," cc. 15, 31, and "*Philosophoumena*," l. x. c. 3; and in both treatises a remarkable silence is observed regarding the Holy Ghost—by Novatian throughout, by the author of the "*Philosophoumena*" where he makes profession of fully stating the true doctrine concerning the Deity. During the Sabellian controversy it was to be expected that less attention would be drawn to the relations of the third Person of the Adorable Trinity: this unexpected coincidence between Novatian and the author of the "*Philosophoumena*" must be allowed to confirm Padre Armellini's hypothesis.

At first sight, the placing of the Quartodecimans among the heretics would seem to militate against Novatian's claim. But, if it be remembered



that the Novatians adopted the Quartodeciman error only after the death of their leader, during the reign of Valens, and that Socrates expressly bears witness that the Novatians at Rome conformed to the practice of the Universal Church, it will be plain that the objection is only apparent. One more difficult to deal with is to be found in the condemnation of re-baptism by the writer of the "Philosophoumena." The Novatians were reproached by S. Cyprian for baptizing those who joined their schism: the fact is very fully authenticated. Does not this opposition compel us to abandon Novatian's pretensions? Padre Armellini thinks that Novatian might quibble about the name, deny the validity of the first baptism, and assert the Novatian rite to be in fact the first. Unfortunately this was the defence adopted by the African *rebaptizantes*, who are held up as innovators in the "Philosophoumena;" and Padre Armellini himself does not consider the explanation satisfactory. He conjectures that the attack on Agrippinus may be intended as a cover under which Novatian wishes to revenge the opposition raised by the archdeacon Callixtus to his ordination, on the plea of the irregularity incurred by his baptism at the point of death. Perhaps more weight may be allowed to the known dishonesty of Novatian: the writer of the "Opusculum contra Novatianum" mentions one of his resources to have been to bring against his adversaries the very accusations brought against himself. At least, there is reason for pausing before deciding the question of the authorship of the "Philosophoumena" against Novatian on account of this one apparent divergency regarding second baptism, in which the parallelism between the author of the "Philosophoumena" and Novatian seems to fail.

It is not our intention at present to test Padre Armellini's view by a closer comparison with the "Philosophoumena." Our purpose has been to give an outline of his argument. On the whole we think he has assigned sufficient reasons why the claim of Novatian ought to be carefully weighed. The general resemblance between Novatian and the writer of the "Refutation of all Heresies" is very striking: the more prominent objections, as we have seen, may be answered satisfactorily; and we think that little remains but to institute a more minute comparison. At the same time, we would respectfully suggest to Padre Armellini whether it would not be well to clear up the uncertainty in which Novatian's career at present remains, and, if possible, to add further confirmations of the period assigned for the composition of the work. For, after all, the postponement of the composition of the "Philosophoumena" to the second part of the third century is the *postulatum* which previous writers on this vexed question would be much disposed to deny.

---

*The History of Girolamo Savonarola and of his Times.* By PASQUALE VILLARI, Professor of History in the University of Pisa. Translated from the Italian by LEONARD HORNER, F.R.S., with the co-operation of the Author. 2 vols. London: Longmans. 1863.

**M**R. HORNER has translated a work which cannot fail to interest many readers, and for most will possess not a little novelty. Hitherto, with the exception of Dr. Madden's somewhat imperfect and inaccurate work, and an able chapter in Rio's "Poetry of Christian Art," no biography or work of any great value has appeared in the English language relating to Savonarola. And although the pens of many foreign historians have not been idle, yet the vicissitudes of Savonarola's posthumous fame, scarcely less remarkable than the fitful and feverish character of his actual career, have been such as to leave ample room for the labours of any fresh biographer. Many men are heroes or wretches according as they are estimated by friends or enemies. But there are few who do duty in so many causes, or are claimed by so many adverse parties, as the Florentine friar. That writers of his own order, fired with an enthusiasm caught directly from him, should worship him as a combination of all excellencies, a profound philosopher and politician, a wise legislator, an eloquent preacher, as well as a prophet, saint, and martyr; that others, such as the sceptical Bayle and the Jesuit Rastrelli, should find in him nothing to admire, and should consign his name to contempt as a low and ridiculous impostor;—is not so wonderful. But it is astonishing that, friar as he was, he should be extolled by religious Protestant writers as the first to raise the standard of Biblical Christianity against the corrupt traditions of Rome; that he should be considered to have begun what Luther was destined to complete; to have anticipated that reformer in his doctrine of justification by faith only; and to have been in Italy what Wycliffe was in England, and Huss in Bohemia, a morning star of the Reformation. And perhaps more wonderful still is the zeal with which modern authors have striven to set him up as a champion of civil and religious liberty, a leveller, and a revolutionist alike in theory and practice. The public, therefore, may well be curious to see whether, under Professor Villari's hands, Savonarola undergoes any fresh transformation.

A thorough acquaintance with Italian history, a clear head, and lively style, are the qualifications which Professor Villari has brought to the task of studying and re-writing Savonarola's life. He has evidently spared neither diligence nor labour. Many years were occupied in reading all the modern works—Italian, German, French, and English—in examining the statements of contemporaneous writers, in analysing the works of Savonarola himself, and carefully reading and collating original documents, many of which Professor Villari had for the first time discovered. No one can read the book without admiring the patient research of the author into every source of information, though we are reluctantly compelled to remark that he would have better consulted the convenience of future students, had he been less loose and vague in his references. In other respects he has addressed himself to his task in the true spirit of historical criticism. He saw the necessity of

submitting the details of Savonarola's epoch to a searching scrutiny. He has accordingly examined with much care the constitution of Florence, the political state of Italy, and the tendencies of philosophical speculation in the fifteenth century.

The result is a triumphant vindication of the Catholicity of Savonarola in point of doctrine. Whatever he was, he was not what is now understood by a "Bible Christian." His views neither coincided with, nor in any way led to, the *servum arbitrium* of Luther or the predestination of Calvin. A reformer, indeed, he was, but in the sense in which the Council of Trent was a reforming council—initiating a work which was afterwards to be carried out, with more prudence and on a grander scale, but scarcely with more zeal, by S. Charles Borromeo and S. Pius V. As a refutation, therefore, of the extravagant fancies of Rudelbach, Meier, and all who would make of Savonarola a thoroughgoing Protestant, Professor Villari's book is highly satisfactory. Henceforth, whatever view be taken of the friar's conduct, at least we shall be spared the pain of seeing him dressed up in Protestant disguise. Similarly impossible will it be, for the future, to adopt the notion of his having been a hypocrite, or a mere fanatic. The testimony of all his contemporaries, whether friendly or hostile, to the purity of his life and the disinterestedness of his conduct, makes it impossible to doubt his sincerity; whilst the depth and general sobriety of his views on all the great questions of politics, philosophy, and theology, shown in the many able treatises he wrote, equally disprove the charge of fanaticism.

So far the labours of Professor Villari have proved eminently successful. But he is not so happy in his attempt to assign to Savonarola his real place in the history of Italy and of mankind. "He exhibited," says the Professor, "a combination of genius with superstition, of profound reasoning with trivial sophisms, of sublime heroism with occasionally most unexpected weakness, but, substantially, a lofty, generous, and powerful nature." Such an estimate has all the appearance of impartiality, and is, perhaps, not far from the truth. But there is nothing in the facts brought together by Villari to justify the following rhapsodies scattered up and down the work: "He had within a spirit of aggression which he had no desire to conceal, but was rather anxious to avow. He was the first to raise up, and display before the world, the standard of that epoch which many call the Renaissance. He was the first, in the fifteenth century, to make men feel that a new life had penetrated to and had awakened the human race; and hence he may be justly called the prophet of a new civilization."\* "The men of that time foresaw a new and more vast synthesis of the human race, and felt that they were approaching nearer to God. The blood beat in their pulses with feverish strength; ideas

---

\* If the passage given above may be taken as a fair specimen of the translator's faithfulness to the original, we cannot compliment him on the manner in which he has executed his task. Literally rendered, it runs thus:—"There was in him a spirit of innovation, which we have no wish to conceal; on the contrary, it is the chief object of our work to bring it to the light. Savonarola was the first to raise on high, and to unfurl before the eyes of the world, that banner which many call the banner of the *Rinascenza*. He was the first, in the fifteenth century, to feel that a new life, &c."

followed each other with feverish rapidity ; they were subject to a power greater than themselves, which launched them into an unknown ocean, to discover a land unknown, but divine." "Columbus opened the paths of the ocean, Savonarola began to open those of the Spirit. Both believed themselves to have been sent by God to spread Christianity over the earth ; both had strange visions, which aroused each to his appointed work ; both laid their hand upon a new world, unconscious of its immensity." "He was the first in his time to direct humanity to that goal which, to this day, we have not reached, but to which we are now advancing with redoubled strength. It was his desire that reason and faith, religion and liberty, might meet in harmonious union ; but he did not think that a new system of religious doctrine became therefore necessary." "And when that reform, the necessity of which has become a universal conviction, shall have advanced to the reality of facts, Christianity will have arrived at its true and full development, and Italy will again be at the head of a renovated civilization. Perhaps men may then better comprehend the character and the life of him who, for that cause, suffered a glorious martyrdom !"

This is the language of a believer in the eternal progress of the human race, of a partisan of republican ideas, and an adversary of the Catholic hierarchy. The divine mission of Savonarola was, on this hypothesis, identical with that of modern revolution, or, at best, of those very moderate Catholics and progressists who, with every admiration for their religion as a body of abstract doctrine, feel the influence of the Church in the concrete a burden and an encumbrance. To imagine a land unknown, but divine, somewhere outside the existing constitution of the Church ; to open up a path of the Spirit, above and beyond the path shown us by her actual rulers ; to approach nearer to God by unauthorised ways ; to spread a Christianity over the earth more perfect than that which has all along existed ; in a word, to reform the Church according to ideas never sanctioned by her when reforming herself, is nothing more or less than to map out an Utopia which never has been, and never can be, identical with the Church of Christ. This sort of sublimated Catholicity has been the dream of many with just enough of speculative faith to make them adhere to Catholic dogma, but without that humble, practical, and obedient faith, which accepts God's Church as a dominant reality, rightly claiming to make its influence and authority felt in every sphere of human existence. To adopt it is to launch upon a sea, vast and desolate, across whose waters the Spirit who rules and animates the Church sends none of His enlightening rays, and whose waves assuredly will never carry the presumptuous souls who commit themselves to it to any divine or heavenly shore.

But it is not our business now to expose the fallacies of liberalism and naturalism in general : we have only to inquire by the light of Professor Villari's own narrative whether, in point of fact, Savonarola is to be looked upon as a champion by anticipation of those modern theories of progress and independence which make up what is called the new civilization. Was it, or was it not, to promote such theories that Savonarola sacrificed his life ? Professor Villari's own work shall supply in great measure the data for our solution of this question.

The whole of Savonarola's history turns upon two cardinal facts : his hostility to the actual rulers of Florence, and his antagonism to the Court of Rome. The problems to be solved in respect of these facts are : whether in assailing the former he was struggling to promote republicanism in the modern sense of the word ; and whether his disobedience to the latter was owing to a dislike on principle of the temporal power of the Pope, and to a theoretic exclusion of the Church from the spheres of science and politics.

Material progress and moral stagnation had long before trained Florence for a dynastic yoke which had its origin in the democratical party, and which succeeded, early in the fifteenth century, in the establishment of a despotic sway amidst the dead forms of a republican constitution. The family of the Medici had, after occasional reverses, riveted itself tightly on the neck of the republic, and at the date of Savonarola's appointment to the priory of S. Mark, Lorenzo the Magnificent held the destinies of Florence entirely in his own hands. The fruits of the loss of freedom, and of the oppressive Medicean rule, had already attained a frightful development. Corruption reigned in every department of the State, and the poor were the victims of a heartless usury. The *Accademia Platonica*, started by Gemistus under the patronage of Cosmo de' Medici, and revived by the joint efforts of Lorenzo de' Medici and Ficino, had introduced into philosophy, and every other branch of knowledge, ideas essentially pagan. Gemistus, indeed, seems to have entertained the hope of a revival of the worship of the heathen deities ; whilst Ficino reduced the proofs of the truth of Christianity to the testimony of the Sibyls, of Virgil, and of Plato, and the comforting assurance of Porphyry that the gods had benignly borne witness in favour of Jesus Christ. Through the influence of Lorenzo a philosophy, which was a fusion of Neo-Platonism with scraps gathered from all heathen antiquity, had become, along with the revived study of the classics, the universal rage at Florence. Some talked wildly of calling on the Pope to canonize Plato, who already received religious honours in the Academy. The highest merit—we are sorry to find that Professor Villari considers it a merit—of Ficino's philosophy was to clear the way for the bold pantheism of Giordano Bruno.

This paganism had spread quickly from philosophy to every branch of science and art. The whole intellect and taste of Florence lay prostrate at the feet of paganism. Everywhere the Christian element was fast disappearing ; literature, slavishly tied down to ancient models, had lost all nerve and vigour ; Tibullus, Catullus, and even Ovid's "*Art of Love*" were favourite books in the schools ; a taste had arisen for bastard classic buildings ; the sensuous element in painting was rapidly developed ; pagan decorations filled the churches, and pagan illustrations and allusions supplanted Scripture and the Fathers in Christian pulpits. The practice of religion was confined to mere external ceremony ; and those who led the age in taste, skill, and refinement had not only lost all faith themselves, but held up its defenders to universal ridicule. It is not surprising that under these circumstances paganism re-appeared in the sphere of morals. Licentiousness was frightfully prevalent in all ranks, and oppression of the poor, the inevitable consequence of throwing the religion of the poor into the shade, was a crime common to almost all the banking class, to which the Medici belonged.

Such was the state of things which afflicted the heart of the devout Savonarola when he came to Florence. Though master of no despicable amount of knowledge in all "the learning of the Egyptians," he was too deeply versed in purely ecclesiastical studies, too thoroughly imbued with the principles of S. Thomas and the lessons he had learnt from constant meditation on Scripture at the foot of his crucifix, too practically schooled to humility and mortification, not to be deeply moved by the shocking spectacle of the Cross trampled under foot, or, at best, set aside to make way for the insignia of paganism. This paganism, then, was the hydra-headed enemy he set himself singlehanded to combat in all its forms. And it was only because he saw that the Medici were at the bottom of all these evils, that he withstood their influence, and strove with all his incomparable energies to arrest the unconstitutional exercise of their usurped authority. The triumph of the Cross was the object he had at heart, and the Cross could only triumph by the ruin of paganism, and of those to whom paganism owed its ascendancy. This, and not revolution or democracy for their own sakes, was the object of all his endeavours. He never disguised his own deeply-seated love of monarchical principles. Had a monarchy on any true basis been possible for Florence, he would never, when the current of events forced him against his will into the position of a legislator, have contented himself with giving to his city a constitution partly traditional in Tuscany, partly modelled on that of Venice. His own ideal was evidently unattainable, so he fell back upon republicanism, and that not the republicanism of our times, as the system least likely under the circumstances to undo his work of destroying paganism. He had no other theory of progress to apply in the sphere of politics, except the establishment of sufficient liberty to admit of the triumph of religion. For proofs of the correctness of this view we have only to appeal to the pages of Professor Villari. We base our conclusions on the facts which he narrates, merely disengaging them from the theories he so eagerly supports. It is simply monstrous, in the face of those facts, to exhibit Savonarola as one of the New Men, a prophet of the New Civilization, half a Neo-Platonist in philosophy, and wholly a Democrat in politics. It is another question whether he always acted with prudence in the selection of means for realizing his projects. Sometimes, doubtless, his enthusiasm carried him beyond the limits of discretion; but the evils to be contended against were so gigantic that measures less energetic and decisive than those he employed would in all probability have been ineffectual.

Savonarola's antagonism to the Court of Rome was produced by causes similar to those which roused him against the Medici. He had fallen on the evil days of Pope Alexander VI.—days of avarice, luxury, and infidelity. Making every deduction on the score of malicious misrepresentation and exaggeration, it is impossible to deny that the Borgia family were a great scandal to Italy and the Church. We are not prepared to accept with Professor Vallari's unquestioning faith the simoniacal character of Alexander's election to the Papacy. Muratori has long since ably disposed of that accusation. Nor can we repeat unhesitatingly after Guicciardini the monstrous stories which he relates of Alexander's hideous immorality, though,



unlike many of his followers, putting them forth only as vague rumours, originated by the lampoons of licentious Neapolitan poets. But it is clear that frightful disorders did at that time exist in and about the Court of Rome, and that everything which came to Savonarola's ears was calculated to excite the indignation of a man jealous, as he was, of the dignity and holiness of the sacred ministry. With a corrupt clergy, and a Papal Court stained with the vices of ambition, luxury, and avarice, he saw little reason to expect permanent reform in the manners of the Florentines or any other peoples in Italy. The vengeance of God hanging over his country perpetually haunted his imagination and pierced his heart, till he worked himself up to a belief in his own divine call to denounce these evils from the pulpit, and to lash unsparingly all manner of wickedness in high places. Meanwhile, his theories of Church government and his doctrine on the subject of obedience were wholly in accord with those of S. Thomas and the greatest theologians in the Church. "It is manifest," he says, in the "Triumph of the Cross," "that all the faithful ought to rally round the Holy Father, as supreme head of the Roman Church, mistress of all other Churches, and that *whosoever departs from the doctrine of the Church of Rome departs from Christ.*" And in one of his sermons: "When it clearly appears that the commands of our superiors are contrary to those of God, and especially to what charity demands, no one in such a case ought to obey them, for it is written: '*Oportet obedire magis Deo quam hominibus.*' If, however, the case be not self-evident, if there be the slightest doubt, then we ought always to obey." When he came to apply this principle to his own case he may or may not have been under a delusion. In the one hypothesis, the plea of special inspiration, put in for his conduct by Natalis Alexander and other writers of high name and unsuspected orthodoxy, must be admitted; in the other, the fault lay, not in the erroneousness of his principles, but in their mistaken application. We may lament the weakness which broke down under that most trying test of supernatural heroism, the call to give up a holy work at a critical moment in the spirit of submission to ecclesiastical authority; but we can neither condemn him as a heretic, nor extol him as a precursor of modern liberalism or theoretic rebellion against the temporal power of the Pope. If he wandered for a time, transgressing the bounds of Christian prudence and holy obedience, at any rate the sufferings he underwent at his trial brought him to his senses. He not only died a true son of the Church, but, the feverishness of the past having subsided, he, in the spirit of penance and heroic resignation, washed out with his blood (as we may confidently believe) whatever stain of imperfection he had, through misguided enthusiasm, contracted.

"Nothing is here for tears, nothing to wail,  
Or knock the breast; no weakness, no contempt,  
Dispraise, or blame; nothing but well and fair,  
And what may quiet us in a death so noble."

Upon this portion of his history the documents discovered by Professor Villari have thrown much additional light. The records of all his examinations are now before the world—indelible monuments at once of Savonarola's heroism, and of the treacherous malice of his unscrupulous persecutors.

We cannot close this notice without drawing attention to a strange blunder which occurs in one of the author's notes (vol. ii. p. 61). He there says that Julius II. issued, Jan. 14, 1505, a bull, which he caused to be confirmed by the Lateran Council, in which the election of Alexander was declared to be null, and that it could not be considered to have acquired any validity by the subsequent homage of the cardinals. It was not likely that Julius would have published a bull which would invalidate his own election no less than that of his predecessor. And, in fact, Alexander's name does not once occur in the bull in question, which is entirely prospective in all its clauses, and could, of course, have no retrospective value. The most that can be said is, that Julius was probably induced to draw up this instrument by his knowledge, or suspicion, of simoniacal practices in recent elections.

It will be apparent from what has been said, that Professor Villari's book is more valuable for its facts than for its theories. He has demolished the fanciful labours of many of his predecessors: it is a pity that, with all his diligence and acumen, he should have produced in their stead a portrait of Savonarola wonderfully accurate in detail, but wholly unfaithful in the general impression which it conveys. It is impossible to recommend without reserve a book which makes the history of Savonarola serve the cause of a liberalism and a moderate Catholicism to which that fervent friar was wholly a stranger, and from which every feeling of his pious heart would have recoiled with horror.

---

*Vie de la Vénérable Mère Agnès de Jésus*, Religieuse de l'Ordre de Saint Dominique, etc. Par M. DE LANTAGES, Prêtre de Saint-Sulpice. Nouvelle édition, soigneusement revue et considérablement augmentée, par M. l'Abbé LUCOT. 2 tom. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand.

*Vie de la Bienheureuse Esprit de Jésus*, du Tiers Ordre de Saint Dominique. Ecrite par M. JEAN DUPONT, corrigée par le R. P. Fr. AMBROISE PORTON, des Frères Prêcheurs. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand. (Bibliothèque Dominicaine.)

*La Vénérable Jeanne Marie de la Croix*, Franciscaine, et son Epoque: Tableau du XVIIème. Siècle. Par BEDE WEBER. Traduit par CHARLES SAINTE-FOI. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand. (Bibliothèque Franciscaine.)

*Madame Acarie*: Etude sur la Société Religieuse au XVIème et XVIIème Siècles. Par G. DE CADOUAL. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand.

THE religious press of France—on which, for the present, it is our own lot to depend in great measure for such productions—is, we are happy to see, becoming yearly more and more prolific in such volumes as the first three of those which we have here grouped together. The endless variety of character that is found among the Saints and servants of God,—even among those, the most prominent of all, but still limited in number, who have reached, or are on their way to, the honours of Beatification and Canonization—multiplying indefinitely the aspects of that one perfect Pattern of which all are partial reflections—seems also to point to a corresponding variety

of needs and tastes among the children of the Church, who have not one saintly example too many to help them to the understanding and imitation of the character of the Incarnate Word. We need hardly say, then, that we welcome the lives before us with great gratitude; all the more, perhaps, because, when due precautions are taken and the legitimate sanctions obtained, they are safer than other classes of spiritual works. We have heard of books of devotion and asceticism being "got up" simply for the market. In England we are unfortunately less in danger from such speculations, as they would not be very likely to prove remunerative; but in France, where the "market" is so extensive and the demand so great, such things have been, and are. It is less easy, however, to do this with the Lives of holy persons.

Three of the Lives before us belong to the seventeenth century,—a period with the saintly treasures of which we are not yet half acquainted. Two of them relate to persons whose "causes" have been introduced at Rome, and who would probably have been long ago beatified but for the troublous times at the close of the eighteenth century. In the matter of beatifications, as well as in so many other departments, we are now laboriously making up for the evil done, and the good prevented or delayed, by the events of those disastrous times. The same two—the Mère Agnes de Jésus, and Jeanne Marie de la Croix—bring us across some of the most notable instances of the work of Catholic revival and restoration of the time in which they lived—the labours of M. Olier for the improvement of the French clergy, and the noble stand made in the Tyrol and elsewhere by the House of Austria during the Thirty Years' War. The path of the other—Esprite de Jésus—lay entirely out of the way of anything that can be called historical.

Agnes Galand was the daughter of a poor cutler of Puy, born in 1602. She grew up under the shadow of the celebrated shrine of our Blessed Lady for which that place is famous, and we find her earliest years full of instances of that attraction to piety, devotion, charity, and mortification, which so often marks the opening career of highly privileged souls. At a very early age she made a vow never to marry: she was always remarkable for an extreme love both for purity and penitence. Her great desire was to be able to consecrate herself to God in the religious state; but her poverty and low birth prevented this. At the age of nineteen, however, she received the habit of the Third Order of S. Dominic, living still in the world. Her life continues at this time to be full of wonderful privileges—such as miraculous communions, and the like—as well as great instances of virtue, especially a great charity for the distressed in body or soul. After a series of severe trials and contradictions, she was admitted as a *sœur converse* into a newly-founded convent of Dominicanesses at Langeac, in 1623. She was then twenty-one years of age. Nothing seemed more improbable than her success in obtaining admission, till it was obtained. In the same wonderful way she was promoted to be a choir sister in the following year. She suffered at this time very extraordinary temptations against the vocation to which she had so long aspired: they were so violent and powerful, that it appears as if she would actually have left the convent, but for the sagacity of her Supérieure. The trial ceased at the time of her profession. After a time

we find her in the post of Mistress of Novices ; and the chapter in which an account is given of her exercise of this office is one of singular interest and beauty. She became Supérieure herself in 1626, in the quality of Vicairé only : in the following year she was elected Prioress ; but after occupying the office for more than two years with great prudence and charity, she was exposed to calumnious reports, which prevailed even upon her own religious sisters to petition the Bishop to depose her. This was done in 1630. She was soon, however, cleared from all charges, and regained her former ascendancy over the minds of the inmates of the convent and the world at large ; in 1634 she was again elected Prioress, only, however, to die in the autumn of that year. We have already alluded to her particular office with regard to the saintly founder of S. Sulpice. She received a special injunction in 1631 to pray for him, and continued from that time to exert herself by prayers and penances in his behalf with an ardour and perseverance that could not fail to be rewarded. He attributed his own perfect conversion to her intercession. They were quite unknown to one another : but in a retreat that he was making at Paris, under the guidance of S. Vincent de Paul, the Mère Agnes appeared to him with a crucifix in one hand and a *chapelet* in the other, intimating that the cross and the devotion to our Lady were to be the guides of his life. Even then he remained ignorant whom it was that he had seen ; but after his retreat he returned to the Abbey of Pébrac, which he held *in commendam*, in the neighbourhood of Langeac, and became acquainted with his benefactress. They had frequent conversations together, and he always honoured her as the mother of his soul. His devotion to her has passed, as a sacred inheritance, to his children. The Life which the Abbé Lucot has just republished is the work of a Priest of S. Sulpice. The members of that institution have also been always foremost in the attempts made at various times to procure the beatification and canonization of the Mère Agnes.

The two handsome volumes before us testify abundantly to the honour in which her memory is still held, and to the zeal and industry of their compiler. The original Life by M. Lantages has been supplemented and completed, and copious notes and *pièces justificatives* have been added. Local research has also done its part : every spot that could be connected with the life of Agnes, either at Puy or Langeac, has been carefully catalogued and illustrated. A copious index of matters—a luxury too often looked for in vain in French publications—shows that the loving diligence of the writer has spared itself no pains to make his work complete. It is a noble monument to the memory of Agnes, raised, no doubt, with a view to advance the cause of her beatification. It is somewhat too large for the ordinary readers of Saints' Lives, and might with great profit be abridged for their benefit, as it contains a considerable amount of matter—such as the history of her cause at Rome, and a great number of miracles, not very different from one another in character—with which they could afford to dispense.

The life of Esprit de Jésus is of a bulk more accessible to the class of readers of whom we have just been speaking, and contains just the kind of matter to make it useful as a guide for the Tertiaries of S. Dominic, for whom it is intended. Père Potton does not tell us anything about the author,

M. Jean Dupont, whose works he has edited and corrected. He has, we think, been mistaken in leaving the name "*la Bienheureuse*" on his title-page, notwithstanding an explanatory declaration in smaller type, that nothing more is meant by it than to conform to a usage popular in certain parts. The name "Blessed" should be kept for those whom the Church has beatified. If the cause of *Esprite de Jésus* has ever been so much as introduced, *Père Potton* does not tell us so. *Esprite Jossaud* was born at Carpentras, in Provence, in 1628, of parents in moderate circumstances. Her piety was remarkable from her earliest years; and the love of purity, leading on to the desire for the religious life, possessed her when quite a child. At twelve she was sent to an Ursuline convent for education: she at once became conspicuous for virtue far beyond her age, and at thirteen made a vow of perpetual chastity. On her applying, however, for leave to become a religious, her mother not only opposed her wish with the utmost violence, but took her at once from the convent. After this time her life was spent at home: all her efforts to become a religious, even after the death of her mother, having proved fruitless. Not long after leaving the convent she became a Tertiary of S. Dominic. She was the example and edification of every one in her native town, the visible Providence of the poor and distressed,—one of the many instances of the most eminent sanctity and the practice of the most sublime virtues in the ordinary paths of life outside the walls of the cloister. It is this that makes her history so admirable a manual for the Tertiaries of S. Dominic, to whom it is dedicated. The book is simply and gracefully written, with little of that technical cast about it which gives a kind of stiffness to many Lives of Saints that have been drawn up upon the foundation of processes of Beatification. *Père Potton* tells us that almost the only additions he has made consist of a chapter on the history of the Third Order, and some remarks on the devotion of the Rosary. She died in 1658, and began immediately to be held in great veneration at Carpentras; the devotion of the people being frequently rewarded by miracles wrought through her intercession. Her tomb appears to have been profaned during the revolutionary times, and does not now contain any of her relics.

We have to cross the Alps to reach the scene of the third holy life before us. *Jane Mary of the Cross—Bernardine Floriani*—was born at Roveredo, in the Italian Tyrol, in 1603. Although very pious and pure in her youth, her soul was not entirely conquered to God without many a struggle. For some years, as a girl, she was fond of youthful vanities; and at a later period, after she had had great experience of supernatural favours, she fell back again under the injudicious guidance of an ignorant confessor, who forbade her to make mental prayer, and taught her to distract herself by worldly thoughts whenever she found herself strongly drawn to heavenly emotions. As M. Olier was the fruit of the intercession of *Mère Agnes*, so she was the child of the prayers and penances of a celebrated Capuchin of that day, *Father Thomas of Bergamo*, one of the great champions of the Catholic cause in those regions during that terrible crisis. After a long resistance, she yielded entirely to the impulses of grace, made a vow of perpetual chastity, and began to make rapid progress in virtue. In a short time she began to act upon her neighbours, and became the soul and life of good and charitable

works in her native town. She opened a school, which was soon crowded with girls from the best families of the place : she exerted herself to save young women from danger, and to bring them back to virtue when they had fallen from it. No kind of misery but found an assistant in her : she is noted as having shown particular compassion for the poor wretches condemned to death as sorcerers. We find her soon at the head of a pious congregation of ladies, developing with activity and prudence the enormous influences for good of which such associations are capable. By her courage and perseverance she was enabled to establish a similar congregation at Trent. Her great achievement, however, urged upon her and others with particular earnestness by Father Thomas of Bergamo, was the foundation of a convent of Clarisses at Roveredo. Innumerable difficulties had to be surmounted before this establishment could be made ; but in the end she triumphed over them all. The first four or five years of the new convent were strangely disturbed, simply, as it seems, from an injudicious arrangement as to its government. Bernardine and the associates she had assembled to form the new community were Italians. It was necessary, in order to train them in the rule and customs of the Clarisses, that they should have for a time a superior and mistress of novices from another convent ; and the religious sent for this purpose were taken from Brixen, in the Austrian Tyrol. The difference of language, manners, and character between the strangers and their new subjects produced endless trouble, a great share of which fell chiefly upon Bernardine, who was professed under the name by which she was afterwards generally known—Jane Mary of the Cross. The strangers retired to Brixen in 1655, five years after the foundation, and Jane Mary was soon afterwards elected Abbess. After founding another convent at Borgo, she died in 1673.

The line of life that we have thus shortly sketched is neither uncommon nor remarkable among the eminent servants of God. The peculiarity of the life of Jane Mary of the Cross lay in the times in which she was cast, and in the peculiar influence that she exercised upon her neighbourhood and country, even upon several of the most eminent champions of the Catholic cause in the pulpit and in the field. It was the time of the Thirty Years' War. Religion and the faith were in danger everywhere. The king of France was not ashamed to avail himself of the troubles of Germany to aggrandize his own power, even at the expense of assistance to the Protestants. The Turks penetrated through Hungary up to the gates of Vienna itself. Spain was weakened by its Italian possessions and the war of Portugal. The Tyrol was at that time a kind of citadel for Catholicism, and the court of Innspruck its strongest support. Jane Mary was in close and continual communication with many of its members, and her counsels were often followed by generals and statesmen, as well as by preachers and the leaders of the Catholic revival.

It is creditable to a Frenchman to have translated a work which, however incidentally, certainly throws considerable discredit upon the policy of Louis XIV. Jane Mary of the Cross was ardently anti-Gallican, in every sense of the word. On the other hand, she was devoted to the House of Austria, not merely from loyalty, but because it was at that time the bulwark



of the Catholic cause. We have a curious saying of hers as to the mission of that family. The Archduchess Anne of Medici, wife of Ferdinand Charles, Prince of the Tyrol, was one of her intimates, and seems to have expressed to her her sorrow that she had no male issue. "It is not without reason," said Jane, "that so many archduchesses are born in the House of Austria. Its mission is to revive the Catholic religion; and the holy women whom it has furnished have done such important service in this respect, that we must not be surprised if God chooses to multiply such auxiliaries" (p. 427.)

The chapters explaining the relation of Jane Mary to the history of her epoch are, after all, rather obscure, and perhaps, to some extent, injure the work, if it is to be considered simply as the life of a saint. There is also a want of arrangement about the whole. The documents open to the author seem to have been abundant; and perhaps he has let himself be somewhat bewildered in their use. Jane Mary, like the Mère Agnes, has, as we have said, been on her way to the honours of Beatification; but the cause seems to have fallen to the ground upon the measures taken by the Emperor Joseph II. against religious orders, towards the close of the eighteenth century.

M. de Cadoudal's little book on Madame Acarie — better known as the Blessed Mary of the Incarnation — expressly disclaims the character of the Life of a Saint. The author parts from his heroine at the door of the Carmelite convent in which the few last years of her life were spent, after she had been the chief instrument in introducing into France the daughters of S. Teresa. His object is to show her influence upon the society of her time — a stirring time too, as she was the wife of one of the most active members of the League, and was also highly esteemed and trusted by Henri IV. M. de Cadoudal's sketch is graphic, and, as far as its brevity permits, complete; but it lacks details. Moreover, it is both more philosophical and more profitable not to separate what can be known of the interior life of a holy person from its external manifestations and effects upon things around her. We trust that Catholic society has many who in a degree resemble Madame Acarie; but if others are to be taught to be like her, their study must begin from within, where alone can be found the secret of her force and her success.

---

*A Letter on the Management of Schools; addressed to some of the Priests of the Diocese of Southwark.* By Rev. J. G. WENHAM, Ecclesiastical Inspector of Schools of the Diocese. London: Burns & Lambert. 1863.

WE should appear hyperbolical if we expressed to the full how admirable this pamphlet appears to us in its own line. It is most refreshing to meet with a work so completely free from pretension, and in which the writer with so much plain simplicity pursues a practical end. Mr. Wenham eschews all theorising on abstract principles, and confines himself to giving some valuable suggestions, founded on his large experience as school manager and school inspector, on the most effective method of training our poor in religious truth.

It must be admitted, we suppose, that the education of the leisured classes is even more important for the Church's best interests than education of the poor, notwithstanding the great inferiority in numbers of the former to the latter class. Unless the leisured classes are both deeply and extensively disciplined in Catholic doctrine and principles, there is serious danger of their unconsciously imbibing a profoundly anti-Catholic spirit. This danger is far more imminent in proportion as their intellectual education in its secular aspect is more effectively and vigorously conducted. And sad experience shows how grievously men of wealth and station, if imbued with such a spirit, can thwart the priest's proper work and impede the sanctification of souls. On the other hand, it is difficult to exaggerate the services which may be rendered to the priesthood by a body of intelligent laymen thoroughly grounded in the principle of submission to the Church. We may fairly say, therefore (putting aside, of course, all reference to *ecclesiastical* education, with which the reviewer, as such, has no concern), that the one most important Catholic work of our time is the religious training of our leisured classes.

But if the education of the poor yields in importance to this one work, it takes precedence surely of every other; and great is the reward which those may expect who devote themselves zealously to its advancement. We have called it one work; but considering the early age at which poor children leave school, we may rather say that it consists, in fact, of two: viz. (1) the well ordering of the Catholic school; and (2) the retaining influence over those who have left school and entered into active life. It would appear, from the testimony of priests well versed in practical matters, that, as yet, this latter work has been much less successfully accomplished than the former, and that the difficulties which it presents are most serious and discouraging; though at the same time, it is certain that various hopeful signs are appearing in the horizon of a brighter future. At all events, the earlier work is absolutely necessary as a foundation for the later; and every improvement in the former renders the latter more easy of accomplishment. And it is entirely to the earlier of these two works that Mr. Wenham directs his present pamphlet.

He begins by asking, "What is meant by a good school?" and he gives the admirable reply, that "it is a place in which children are to be brought under the influence of all possible motives to virtue, and trained to its practice" (p. 5). His next topics are "schoolrooms" and "school management;" and then comes a very important little section on "school discipline:"

"A good school—such as will effect what has at present to be done with our children—is not one in which mere instruction is skilfully conveyed, but one which works upon their forming, but as yet unformed, character, and fixes it for good. But how is this done? In a small—but a very small—degree, by the precepts, the instruction, of the teacher. In a much greater degree, by his example and character; *i. e.*, not by what he says, but what he does. But the great means of influence is the spirit of the school—that is, the tone of feeling and habit of acting that prevails among the mass of children. We all know the almost irresistible influence of the society in which we live. The worst people will be improved by the society of the good. But children's characters are especially open to the influence of others; they are like metals in a state of fusion, still soft and warm, but daily growing more cold and hard, and settling down into a permanent form and character. This form will be

decided by the character of the society into which they fall ; it is the mould of which naturally they must take the shape. The great object, therefore, to be sought for, is that the form or mould may be a good one ; that the influences which the child is under at school may be so powerful for good, as to counteract the evil influences which he is under elsewhere."

Our author next discusses "rules of admission and expulsion," and then enters on the important question of "punishments." Here again occur some invaluable remarks :—

"Besides vice and sin, there are a number of lesser faults which children are continually committing ; faults against order, against cleanliness, against good manners, against the rules of the school—that carelessness, thoughtlessness, inaccuracy, inattention, which may be at the outside venial sins, or may be none, and which yet it is necessary to cure and keep down. How are these to be treated ? If they are punished as sins, the effect is, the child never comes to have a clear notion of what sin is. The broad distinction between such imperfections, and wilful breaches of God's law, is never drawn. The child sees both visited with similar if not equal punishment, and as he observes that all the children fall more or less into such faults, and feels that he cannot avoid it himself, he comes to look upon punishment not as the consequence of his own act, but as either a matter of chance, or dependent on some higher law of which he is at present ignorant. It is then most important to distinguish in our method of treatment between moral faults and mere faults against rule and good order. The latter may be met by different little penances, light in character and involving no degradation, but sufficiently disagreeable in their repetition to stop the mischief, or at least keep it from spreading ; while we should insist on serious punishments, and especially corporal punishment, being reserved for serious and moral offences,—not to be left to junior teachers, nor to be inflicted in the excitement of the moment, nor without due consideration of circumstances, in order to avoid all chance of injustice, and so that the culprit may not be able to draw any other conclusion but that of his own serious delinquency."

We pass over much which is important in the sections on "other means of influence," and on "rewards ;" and come to the remarks on "religious instruction :"—

"The most important points to attend to in religious instruction, are to insure, first, a great interest in the subject. What is related of a certain preacher is in point here. It is said that he asked a celebrated actor how it happened that the latter contrived to obtain the attention and sympathy of his audience while speaking of unrealities, while he, the preacher, though addressing *his* audience on matters of such tremendous reality and consequence to themselves, yet failed to gain their attention. 'Why,' said the actor, 'I speak of fictions as if they were realities, and you speak of realities as if they were fictions.' Now, in truth, religious instruction is *in itself* the most interesting of subjects, from the intimate relation which its truths have to our own life and prospects ; so that if, as often happens, the children show little interest in it, it is because of the dull and unreal way in which it is taught—not as a subject of special concern to themselves, but as so much of 'lessons,' which must be got through like the rest of the day's drudgery.

"The way in which it will be made interesting, is taking care that it is taught simply and easily, so that the children are not called to keep up their attention to what is really above their capacity, but to what is suited to their

powers of comprehension. Another thing which powerfully helps to the interest the children will feel, and which is of extreme importance in itself, is that they should see it treated with reverence, and not as a common subject. I speak with some diffidence, but it seems to me that teachers often make a mistake in aiming at devotion in the children rather than reverence ; for to make all people devout is not in our power, and to aim at it is dangerous, as leading, in some cases, to a sort of reaction again religion altogether, and in others to a sort of excitement which is taken for devotion, but which has no solid foundation. But it is a proverb that ' without reverence there is no religion ; ' and there are no dangers attending the inculcation of this. On the contrary, it is the atmosphere which will still continue to support faith, even when morality is weakened. It is a strong foundation for devotion, and will influence the wild and headstrong when nothing else can turn them. It should then be ceaselessly enforced both by word and example, and it should, and if it exists, must, appear in the manner of giving religious instruction.

" It will help, too, to make religious instruction interesting, if care is taken to bring out the practical character which it really possesses. Some of the things which children learn may never be of any practical use to them apart from serving to cultivate their minds, and it is anyhow difficult or impossible to make the children see what they have to do with them, or why they should care for them. But this is not so in respect to religion, which teaches them truths which intimately concern them—their practice in this life, their prospects for the next. There is no part of religious instruction which does not directly or indirectly bear on some duty. It either teaches us what God requires of us, or supplies us with the motives or the means for fulfilling it. In other things, the children are instructed in what will or may concern them ; but in religion it is what does concern them. Hence it is not difficult, and at the same time most important, to give a practical turn to religious instruction : illustrating doctrine by God's actual dealings with us, by what happens in the world, by what the children see done by their superiors, by what they are required to do themselves. The unskilful and unpractical manner in which Catechism is often taught is enough to explain the want of interest shown in it."

We would respectfully submit to the Rev. writer whether there is not something slightly exaggerated in his disparagement of efforts to train children in habits of devotion ; but we will not pause to speak further on the matter. On the whole, at all events, nothing can be more reasonable and just than his remarks on the general principles of religious instruction. He then proceeds to consider separately the cases of infants, of younger children not infants, and of older children. On these latter his remarks cannot be too carefully pondered.

" In so many of our schools children are taken away at an early age, that the essential part of religious instruction has to be secured without loss of opportunity. But wherever there are children able to remain to the ages of eleven and upwards, it is very desirable to form from them a third class or division ; for not only is it suitable that they should not be contented with a meagre knowledge of necessary things which is perhaps all that is possible with the other children, but *their progress in the knowledge of secular subjects may become a positive harm to them, unless it is accompanied with a corresponding knowledge of religion.* For a taste for reading, and an acquaintance with subjects of history and science and art, brings them within the reach of all those temptations against faith and morality which are so profusely suggested by the literature of the day. To keep back our children from being as well instructed as others is dangerous to attempt, and often impossible

to succeed in. To keep them from the mischievous literature which is brought to their doors is often equally so. The only thing in our power is to arm them as far as possible against the danger by forewarning them of it, and supplying them with strength to repel it. This is most efficiently done, not by making controversialists of them—far from it—but by making them thoroughly acquainted with their own religion. Controversy and the arguments of objectors are apt to weaken the strength of a truth in the child's mind; *clear and positive knowledge more than anything else render him proof against the assaults of heresy or unbelief.*

"This thorough knowledge of their Catechism is a great security to the faith of the children in more ways than one. It is so because many of the arguments or insinuations against religion only arise from ignorance of it; and the answer to many more is very obvious to those who are well instructed. It is indeed instructive to observe how large a proportion of people's difficulties on religion arise from sheer ignorance of it. But it tells in another and more important way. *A single truth may be impugned, and we may be unable, humanly speaking, to withstand the force of the arguments or insinuations made against it; but if this truth is but part of a system connected with and depending on other truths, it is supported by them and by the strength of the entire system. It is easy for an isolated truth to be weakened or disturbed, but not for a body or system of truths.* Hence, in the present day, when children as they grow up are so liable to be exposed to all sorts of dangers, not only to their virtue, but their faith, it is more than ever desirable to give them the additional security of a thorough and ample knowledge of their Catechism, as teaching a system of Christian doctrine. Our upper classes of children may be led to see how one doctrine follows from another; how what the Catechism teaches of God is illustrated by Scripture history; how what it teaches us of man is witnessed in the world and in ourselves. They may get to know the meaning of the feasts and devotions and practices of piety, which they have ever been accustomed to observe, and how they are but exemplifications of the doctrines which are now explained to them. And especially they may be shown the connection between faith and practice, and how what they are called on to do is but a reasonable duty following from that which they believe. In this way Christian doctrine comes to be understood by them to be, not merely a series of difficult and even unpalatable truths, as the world and the devil would lead them to suppose, but a system and body of living and practical truth—a complete explanation, not indeed of mysteries which are above our comprehension, but of all that God sees fit to tell us at present—'all things that appertain to life and piety.'"

Two sections on the "means of maintaining schools" and "school books and furniture," bring to a close this admirable pamphlet which (we cannot doubt) will be most widely beneficial.

Our present circumstances abound with practical difficulties, as every one admits. We think it would be a great blessing if other excellent priests, who have as much practical experience in their respective lines as Mr. Wenham in his, would follow his example, and put into an available and permanent shape the lessons which such experience has taught them.

---

*The Inquiry of a Retired Citizen into the Roman Catholic Religion.* Written for the information of all Protestants who desire to know in what particulars the Roman Catholic differs from the Protestant form of Faith ; and edited by the Rev. HENRY FORMBY. London : Longman.

THERE are three methods imaginable in which a controversial dialogue may be conducted. Firstly, we may suppose, not only that the opponent is considered to hold certain positive tenets of his own, but also that he is allowed to argue in favour of those tenets with the greatest vigour and adroitness. One of the most striking books conducted on this method is by the old Catholic controversialist Manning, who goes the length of inserting textually the whole of a controversial dialogue written by a Protestant, and intercalating at every step rejoinders to the various replies, so that the Protestant arguments are actually given throughout in the very words of an able advocate.

According to the second imaginable method, the opponent is not allowed indeed to argue very vigorously for his position ; but still is treated as having a position of his own ; as holding some definite assemblage of positive tenets ; as having lived one kind or other of interior life ; and as having accumulated some certain body of pious associations round these tenets as a centre. In this kind of controversy, as in the former, the argument is more or less *ad hominem*. The Catholic disputant endeavours to show, *e.g.*, that the difficulties raised by his opponent against Catholicism are no less cogent against his own system ; and that the various appearances of good presented by that system, which have recommended it to his acceptance, appertain far more truly to the glorious body of Catholic doctrine.

Mr. Formby's able work belongs to neither of these classes. Not to the first, for Mr. Thomas Goodman is the most obliging of opponents ; he recognises at once irrefragable force in every successive argument urged by Mr. Philip Faithful, and misses a thousand opportunities of ingenious cavil, not to say of legitimate and reasonable objection. Nor yet does this work belong to the second class above mentioned ; for Mr. Goodman has "not been attached to one form of religion more than another" (p. 3), and his mind accordingly is very much of a *tabula rasa* on the whole subject. Under these circumstances, the form of "conversations" certainly does not possess the peculiar advantages which otherwise belong to it. Still it is in many respects useful, as breaking up the argument into bits, and so enabling the reader to follow it with less fatigue and perplexity. We should add also that in the work before us the various circumstances and adjuncts of the scene are in many respects skilfully devised and picturesquely represented.

In regard to the argument itself, we think Mr. Formby very far more successful in those passages which relate to the broad and visible notes of the Church, than in those which discuss individual doctrines ; a result, perhaps, which might have been expected from the doctrinal colourlessness ascribed to Mr. Goodman. We would accordingly recommend, as specially worthy the reader's attention, the second dialogue, called, "The Throne of S. Peter in the City of Rome ;" the fifth, called, "The One Apostolic Religion ;" and the



eighth, called, "The Perfect Society of the Church of Rome." Throughout these dialogues the Church's irrefragable claims are set forth with the greatest vigour of thought and expression; and the last-named, indeed, which treats on the question of Nationalism, is (so far as we are aware) altogether new and original.

We give an extract, as furnishing a pertinent answer to a common objection:—

"*Thomas.* How do you account, Philip, for the fact of the present Pope having to be maintained in the possession of his city by foreign bayonets?

"*Philip.* 'Foreign bayonets,' *Thomas*, is only a phrase which you and others are in the habit of using without at all properly understanding what it is you say. Yet you can hardly be ignorant of the fact, that if you were to go to Pius IX. himself, and if you were to ask him by whom he considered that he was being defended in his city, he would answer you at once, that he considered he was being defended by the bayonets of his right dear sons. And if you were to turn to those who are defending him, and were to ask them, 'Whom do you understand yourselves to be defending?' they would immediately reply in the same manner, 'Our own revered Holy Father.' If, then, it be not honourable for a father to be defended by his own right dear sons, and for the right dear children themselves to defend their father, in what cases is defence ever honourable? And if you ask, *Thomas*, how it comes to pass that the Pope is able to do what no other man in the wide world can do, viz, to call all people alike, no matter from what nation or country they may come, his 'right dear children,' see if you can give any explanation of his having this power willingly conceded to him, even by his adversaries, except you seek for the cause of it in his being, at least tacitly, acknowledged by all men to be Vicar of Him who died on the cross to redeem all the sons of men, without either the preference or the exclusion of any."

We are particularly grateful to Mr. Formby for the circumstance that, as he does not attempt to conciliate opponents by any concealment of the fulness or stringency of Catholic doctrine, so neither does he attempt to impose upon them by any illusive pictures of unsullied sanctity and peace as existing within the Church. In several places he draws attention to the fact that no immunity has been promised to the Church from most serious practical evils, and that men have no right, therefore, to be surprised or scandalized if such exist. Wherever and to whatever extent they do exist, as he most truly observes, they arise from the failure of individual Catholics to obey the Church's lessons, and conform themselves to her maxims and general spirit.

---

*Stories from the Old Testament.* By the Author of "Gospel Stories."  
London: Burns & Lambert.

WE consider the object of this little volume an important one, unpretending as is its character. The writer does not profess in these *Stories* to "give anything like a consecutive history of the Old Testament, or even of the principal facts narrated in it; they have been written with a view to interest children in some of the most striking events contained in sacred Scripture, and, by giving them some little idea of the earlier history of the Jews, and of the dealings of God with His chosen people, to throw a greater

light upon, and give a yet deeper interest to, the Gospel histories." We are not aware that anything precisely of this kind has been attempted; and we strongly recommend the book to the attention of mothers of families, and all who are engaged in the sacred charge of training Christ's little ones. The Church has always set great value upon the study of Holy Scripture. Ill-informed Catholics in this country have, we think, been sometimes too ready to forget this fact, and to talk as if the Church was our *substitute* for the Bible—a most erroneous assertion, if taken to mean that it is quite immaterial whether Catholics are conversant or not with Holy Scripture. By talking in this loose way we concede an advantage to Protestants, or, rather, go far to scandalize them. No doubt the wrong use made of the Written Word of God by those outside the Church, who think to substitute their own private interpretation for her authoritative teaching, has led to the careless expressions which we sometimes hear; but the error is one which we cannot too earnestly deprecate. Next to the Sacraments, the Written Word of God is the great nourisher of piety, and the "manna of the soul," as Father Segneri calls it. The Church has always esteemed it so; and because, as a good *materfamilias*, she insists on dispensing with her own hands this Bread of Life to her children, we must not therefore countenance the idea entertained by Protestants, that she desires to keep it safely under lock and key.

Studied as a mere history of the Jews, the early books of the Bible would, indeed, be of little profit to our children; but read as "testifying of Jesus," they become of inestimable value in extending and deepening the Christian's knowledge and love of his Saviour. We cannot begin too early to lay the foundations of a familiar acquaintance with the Old Testament, and guide our children to a right understanding of its leading facts and its embodied prophecies. As they advance in years, this preliminary knowledge is a stepping-stone to a deeper insight into its mystical meanings, so profitable for making progress in the interior life.

Too much has not been attempted in these Little Stories, which are designed for young children. The work is intended to be a companion to the "Gospel Story-Book," by the same author, who observes that the fact of its being, perhaps, less strictly childlike in its language, has been "thought by some, even very young auditors, to be an improvement." We think the writer has been judicious in acting upon the experience thus obtained. Children take no particular pleasure in being addressed as children, so long as what they read is put in a form to interest them. Even an occasional hard word is far from objectionable, if complicated and involved sentences are avoided.

---

*The Church Establishment in Ireland: Past and Present.* Illustrated exclusively by Protestant authorities; with Appendices showing the Revenues of the Established Church, the Religious Census of the Population of Ireland, and other Returns bearing on this subject. Dublin: Warren. 1863.

THE title of this pamphlet sufficiently explains its subject, which is one of paramount importance, not only to Irishmen and Catholics, but to all who have the interest of our common country at heart. Nothing can be more opportune than its appearance, because nothing can be more pressing than the necessity of applying a remedy to this old festering wrong of Ireland, a wrong which adds its special sting to her other crying grievance—the evil system of land-tenure. As the subject is its own recommendation, we shall content ourselves with noticing that the passages selected for quotation from Protestant authorities display a judgment and a skill in the compiler which the able preface from his own pen would have led us to anticipate. We want more of such advocates—men who have the zeal of thoroughgoers without that bitterness and exaggeration which are its not unfrequent accompaniment; who exhibit the dispassionateness and calmness of true moderation without that marring defect to which the so-called moderate are subject—a certain want of clear perception, and frank uncompromising election, of the right side.

Right is right, and wrong is wrong; and truth is not a mean any more than it is an extreme. Truth has been termed a mean, because extremes, which, in fact, are errors, cluster round it on all sides, leaning upon it, as all error must, in order to have an intelligible basis for support; but in itself it is positive, it is central; it is not a matter of equilibrium or balance, a little here and a little there to keep the scales even. We often hear Protestants who are too reasonable not to perceive, and too candid not to acknowledge, the social grievances of Ireland and her past misgovernment, speak of “faults on both sides.” It is a palliative to which they naturally have recourse. But many Catholics also, from the very spirit to which we have just alluded, which is generally accompanied, if not always allied, with the fear of asserting too strongly what will be offensive to the opposing party, will also repeat the same trite phrase. There is a sense, of course, in which it is perfectly true to say that there are generally faults on both sides. Where nations, or any collective number of people, are concerned, it would be a marvel indeed if the aggrieved party were invariably blameless in their conduct. Rarely is this the case even in private dissensions between man and man; for we are faulty creatures, and, even when in the right, we commit secondary faults—often very great ones. How frequently these go so far as to obscure the original merits of the question, every one’s experience must attest. Nay, sometimes the injured party will commit more secondary faults, or such as are more palpable, than the aggressor: he loses his temper, for instance—he commits himself, as we are wont to say. Still it remains equally true that, in the main point, right is on one side, wrong on the other.

“ ‘They are past, the old days ;—let the past be forgotten :  
 Let them die, the old wrongs and old woes that were ours,  
 Like the leaves of the winter, down-trampled and rotten,  
 That light in the spring-time the forest with flowers.’

“ ‘Well sing'st thou, sweet voice ! But the sad voice replieth,  
 ‘Unstaunch'd is the wound while the insult remains ;  
 The Tudor's black banner above us still fieth ;  
 The faith of our fathers is scorn'd in their fanes !

“ ‘Distrust the repentance that clings to its booty ;  
 Give the people their Church, and the priesthood its right :—  
 Till then to remember the past is a duty,  
 For the past is our Cause, and our Cause is our might.’”\*

In the case of the Established Church of Ireland, a Church which numbers in her fold but one-ninth of the whole population, there can be no question on which side is the right and on which side the wrong ; and many Protestants have been forward to confess the injustice as well as the inexpediency of maintaining Protestant ascendancy in that Catholic country. But the amount of testimony which has been here brought together on the subject—the more striking when the eminence and variety of the witnesses are considered—will, we believe, surprise not a few.

The pamphlet will, we trust, find its way, as it deserves, into still more general circulation. The extracts ought to prove interesting, as the compiler observes, to three classes of persons. “To the statesman they recall those moral and political principles by a firm allegiance to which the security of the empire can alone be placed on a permanent basis. To the Protestant gentleman of Ireland they show how ignobly his own order must share in the national weakness produced by sectarian partiality. To the Catholic of every class—the peer and the peasant—they prove that his duty to his religion is identified with his duty to his country, and with the stability of the empire.”

---

*Narrative of a Secret Mission to the Danish Islands in 1808.* By the Rev JAMES ROBERTSON. Edited from the Author's MS. by his Nephew, ALEXANDER CLINTON FRAZER. London : Longmans. 1863.

**M**OST of our readers will learn with surprise that the hero of the curious episode of the great European war which is detailed in this volume was not only a Catholic priest, but a monk of the Benedictine order, and had been for some time a professor in the great ecclesiastical college of Maynooth. His name may, perhaps, be remembered—and if remembered at all, it will be so with much interest—by a few of the older clergy of Dublin, where he was known for a time after his return from this mission by the soubriquet of “Romana Robertson ;” but members of the new school, trained up in the stricter notions of modern clerical life, will be startled by the idea of a priest voluntarily engaging in what may almost be called military service, on behalf of a Protestant government, and especially in a service which involved

---

\* Aubrey de Vere.

no small amount of those arts of disguise and of that false assumption of character and false representation of facts, which, however recognized among the conventional necessities of war, cannot but be regarded as involving very questionable principles of morality.

It is difficult at this distance of time, and in the present altered condition of the world, to carry the mind back to the realities of the period to which this narrative refers. In the complete disruption of society which attended the French Revolution, and the utter destruction of the ecclesiastical establishments, not alone of France, but of almost all the continent of Europe, ecclesiastics of the highest name and of the holiest life were driven to strange shifts in order to obtain the means of even that humble livelihood with which their simple and self-denying habits enabled them to be content; and a curious and deeply interesting narrative might even still be compiled from the recollections of the few survivors who have outlived the vicissitudes of the half century which separates us from the wars of the French Revolution. It is in the spirit which such recollections alone can evoke that Father Robertson's secret mission must be read in order to be appreciated, or even understood.

At the time when Spain, goaded into resistance by the long course of treachery and outrage of which, through the intrigues or the violence of the Emperor Napoleon, she had been made the dupe or the victim, rose in one united effort against the French usurper, a large body of Spanish troops was stationed in the north of Europe, where it formed part of the so-called army of observation under Bernadotte. There cannot be a doubt that the withdrawal of these troops, the *élite* of the Spanish army, from the Peninsula at a crisis so important, was a part of the Emperor's profound and long-prepared scheme for the establishment of a Bonapartist kingdom in Spain. He had compelled the consent of the weak though designing Godoy to a measure to the peril of which that unscrupulous minister was fully alive; and, while the natural defenders of their country were at a distance, having by the arrest of the royal family, the seizure of the frontier fortresses, and the forced abdication of the King, prepared the way for the proclamation of his brother Joseph Bonaparte, he contrived, by the control which he exercised over all the channels of intelligence, to keep the soldiers, and even their officers, as well as the general himself, the Marquis de Romana, in utter ignorance of the events which had taken place in the Peninsula. The British Government, on receiving intelligence of the rising against Joseph Bonaparte in Spain, resolved to second the efforts of the Spanish people for the recovery of their independence; and it was at once determined that an effort should be made at all risks to withdraw this important body of troops from the French service and the French alliance, in the confidence that, once returned to their native land, they would range themselves on the side of their country and their religion. Several attempts, accordingly, were made to open communication with Romana, all of which failed, and in some instances with the sacrifice of the life of the agents who had been employed. It was after these repeated failures that Father Robertson was selected for the perilous but important enterprise of opening communication with the Marquis de Romana.

Father James Robertson was a native of Scotland, and had been a member of the well-known and meritorious Scottish Benedictine community at Ratiabon, where he had formed the acquaintance and attracted the favourable regard of the Duke of Richmond. When this nobleman came to Ireland as Lord-Lieutenant, he gladly renewed his acquaintance with Father Robertson, who was then resident in Dublin and had for a time held a lectureship in St. Patrick's College at Maynooth, and recommended him to the notice of the Chief Secretary, Sir Arthur Wellesley. On the appointment of the latter to the command in Spain, he at once fixed on Father Robertson as specially suited, by his religion and determination of character, and his perfect familiarity with Germany and the German language, for the perilous expedition into Northern Germany, which had failed in all other hands. Father Robertson, in whose eyes, as in those of most ecclesiastics at the time, the cause of Spanish independence was the cause of religion, even more than of national liberty, accepted the office without hesitation; and the little volume now first published is his own narration of his successful mission. It is exceedingly curious, although it is necessary to call up a certain amount of the spirit of the time and of the cause, in order to reconcile oneself to the *suppressio veri*, if not the *suggestio falsi*, in which the enterprise by its very nature repeatedly involved him.

We must refer to the volume itself for details. It will be enough to say that he made his way in the assumed character of a foreigner to Heligoland, whence he succeeded by the aid of a smuggler in being put ashore in the mouth of the Weser, and reached Bremen in safety. There, having procured the baptismal certificate of a German friend, from the Palatinate of Bavaria, he took out a passport in his name, for which he secured the necessary *visés*; and, providing himself with a stock of chocolate and choice cigars, he made his way, by Hamburgh and Lubeck to Kiel. Within a short distance of this port he hired a fishing-boat, by which he was landed in the small island of Assens, and thence proceeded by a similar conveyance to Fünen, where Romana was quartered. Feeling that his best hope of success lay in the assumption of a bold indifference, he actually took up his quarters, in his commercial capacity, in the very hotel which was occupied by General Romana and his staff; and with exceeding caution and dexterity succeeded (although he was entirely unprovided with written credentials, and was obliged to rely altogether on a memento of former acquaintance with General Romana which the Foreign Office had furnished to him) not only in opening a communication with Romana, but in inducing him to accept the offer of the British Government to place the fleet at his disposal for the conveyance of the Spanish army to the Peninsula. The embarkation of the troops, to the number of nearly 10,000, was dexterously effected by Romana; only 300 of the entire body remaining as prisoners of war in the hands of Bernadotte.

We can only find room for a single incident which occurred in Father Robertson's effort to procure a passport at Lübeck, and in which we must confess that he appears to have indeed merged the priestly character in that of the secret agent. He had already obtained the certificate of baptism as related above:—



"The following day I prevailed on the merchant's clerk to apply for a passport at the Town House, as if for a friend who had come from the country on his way to Hamburgh. This was granted without difficulty; but it was necessary that I should make my appearance and sign my name; and such is the force of habit that I began with the initial letter of my real name J, which the town-clerk observing, suddenly called out to me, 'How, sir! did not you tell me that your name was Adam?' It was really an unpardonable blunder, and might have proved fatal but for one of the luckiest thoughts that ever occurred to me in a moment of difficulty. 'Sir,' I replied (and certainly with some embarrassment), 'in the Palatinate of Bavaria, in which I was born, we are in the habit of prefixing Johann (John) to every man's baptismal name, as we do Mary to every woman's; so that we do not say George, Peter, Adam, &c., but Hans (the familiar appellation of John) George, Hans Peter, or Hans Adam.' This is really the case. The explanation wore the air of truth, and saved me for the time."—Pp. 30–32.

Father Robertson, having accomplished his mission, remained abroad until he had reason to hope that the vigilance of the police authorities had somewhat relaxed, and returned to Ireland in safety in the following year. He went back to his convent at Ratisbon in 1815; and, with the exception of a short visit to Scotland in 1818, resided there till his death in 1820.

---

*Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne sous le Règne de Charles II.* (1678—1682).

Par le MARQUIS DE VILLARS. Being a collation of the various editions and manuscripts of these Memoirs now known to exist, with some Inquiry as to their alleged Author. A paper read before the Royal Irish Academy, Monday, Dec. 8, 1862. By DENIS FLORENCE MACCARTHY, M.R.I.A. Dublin: University Press. 1863.

THE episode in bibliographical history detailed in this paper forms a "curiosity of literature" so very remarkable, that we shall condense the facts for the instruction or amusement of those among our readers who have been tempted into the seductive, although too often unprofitable, domains of bibliography.

Mr. Stirling, the well-known writer on Spanish art, being requested to contribute something to one of the miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society, was induced to print for that Society, in 1861, a MS. volume, entitled, "*Mémoires de Villars*," which he had bought for a few shillings at a sale at Sotheby's about ten years previously, and which, after most careful examination and repeated consultations with his literary friends, he concluded had never before been published. The steps by which Mr. Stirling was led to this conclusion are among the most remarkable incidents of the story. He had searched in vain in Brunet, in Quérard, in the "*Biographie Universelle*," and in both editions of the Marquis de Villars' "*Lettres*." He had examined MSS. in the British Museum. He had exhibited the book at several meetings of the Philobiblon Society, and had consulted several of his friends, those especially who were most familiar with the *Mémoires* department of French literature. Sir Frederic Madden had pronounced it as his opinion that the MS. had never been printed. Mr. Stirling had

referred with the same ill-success to the library of Mr. Ford, author of the "Handbook of Spain," had repeatedly consulted with Mr. Ford himself, and, acting under his advice, had addressed a letter to the readers of "Notes and Queries," asking for information as to his unknown MS. Failing all these inquiries, he had, not altogether unreasonably, concluded that the MS. was unpublished, and accordingly had sent it to press.

On Mr. Stirling's volume coming, soon after publication, into the hands of Mr. D. F. MacCarthy, the latter was struck by its general resemblance to a book in his own possession, entitled "*Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne depuis l'année 1679, jusqu'en 1681; Paris, 1733.*" And on a comparison of the two he found, to his infinite surprise, that the two books were literally identical! But what is still more curious, Mr. MacCarthy had purchased this volume at the sale of Mr. Ford, who was one of Mr. Stirling's authorities for the book being unpublished, and who, as appeared from numerous pencil marks, marginal notes, and an observation on the fly-leaf, had read the volume carefully, and had made some conjectures as to its origin and author. Nay, among the sources to which Mr. Stirling had referred for information had been this very library of Mr. Ford, with every book of which he had believed himself acquainted; and, to complete the strange climax of literary blunders and oversights, there is actually printed in his own delightful work on the Artists of Spain, a reference to the very volume which Mr. MacCarthy now identifies as the original of the Philobiblon MS., and to its supposed resemblance to Madame d'Aulnoy's "*Mémoires de la Cour d'Espagne!*"

The particulars of this curious affair are detailed with much vivacity, and with many interesting collateral illustrations, in Mr. MacCarthy's paper. It has furnished no little amusement in bibliographical circles both at home and on the Continent.

*A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London. With Selections from his Correspondence. Edited by his Son, ALFRED BLOMFIELD, M.A. 2 vols. London: Murray.*

WE notice this work for the purpose of drawing the attention of Catholics to some striking comments on the character and career of Dr. Blomfield, which appeared in the *Reader*, a new Protestant literary journal, No. 17. They exhibit a high and Catholic tone of thought, which, in a Protestant writer, is very remarkable. We may add that the criticism appears to us most just.

"A smoother career no man of eminence ever had who, with a strong character of his own, was called to govern in times of conflict. He used to say as a child that he intended to be a bishop, and a bishop he was certainly fitted to become, both by his excellences and defects. Without even a vestige of that peculiar temperament which strains passionately after Truth, without speculative ardour, without imaginative power, Dr. Blomfield possessed every practical quality which a mere administrator of the Church should boast—soundness of practical judgment, alacrity of purpose, vigilance of eye, clearness of thought and fluency of speech, considerable benevolence, great ambition, an inborn respect for formula, and no meditateness of dis-

position. These were just the qualities which best fitted an ecclesiastical leader for ascendancy at the time when the late Bishop of London rose to éminence; and they enabled him to glide along the stream of ecclesiastical preferment with as much ease as dignity. . . . He was an honest, liberal, clear-sighted, and able man of the world, with sufficient tincture of formulated piety to make a good ruler in the Church; but, as for any of the impulses which have impelled men 'to leave all and follow Christ,' he probably understood no more of them than he did of that passionate pursuit of Truth of which we have spoken. He loved power, and used it well; he loved order, and introduced it wherever he went; he loved learning, and turned it to good account; he loved decorum both of the outward and inward man, but assuredly he was never consumed by any of the higher religious passions, and always presented the dignified spectacle of a clever statesman transmuted by a superficially modified education into an ecclesiastic of eloquence and tact, who understood the civilizing duties of a rich national establishment, and the humanizing power of a seemly religion, much better than he understood that 'Word of God which is sharp and powerful as any two-edged sword to the dividing asunder of soul and flesh.' Bishop Blomfield was one of those men whose powers are eminently useful to the Church, but who make one wonder more than ever how the Christian Church rooted itself in the earth. Christianity, bleeding and in rags, is not quite inconsistent with the notion of some of our greater and even titled divines. We can imagine Bishop Butler painfully pondering its announcements, and slowly fixing upon it the grave eager eye of his insatiable spiritual nature till he would have thrown down everything else to press either the thorns or the cross to his heart; we can conceive Bishop Berkeley with swifter and happier enthusiasm welcoming the same sacrifice; but we cannot conceive that Bishop Blomfield would ever have been one of these. His virtues, though great, are all of the salutary civil class. He is, as his son calls him, *vir pietate gravis*, whose piety increases his social influence, and is thought of chiefly in that light; but it is much easier to think of him without his piety than without his social influence. He would assuredly have been shocked by the dreaminess and enthusiasm of the primitive Christianity, would have thought S. Paul flighty, and S. John *exalté*, and the whole proceedings of the early Church a very regrettable inroad on the natural influence of wealth and learning."

---

*The Water-Babies: a Fairy Tale for a Land-Baby.* By the Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.

AS a "Fairy Tale for a Land-Baby," this work is certainly described very absurdly by its author; for the greater part of it consists of a farrago of crude ideas and jesting allusions, either to science or the economy of human life, which could neither be understood by children, nor afford them the amusement they often receive from that which they but imperfectly comprehend. This applies to the bulk of the volume, for the introductory part is pleasantly written as a story, but passes off disagreeably and unartistically into an allegory of a clumsy description, treated with great prolixity, and in a manner that gives one the impression that the writer thinks himself extremely clever for throwing out a succession of fancies, the darlings of his own mind, but which others may not equally appreciate. But we must endeavour to give the reader a general notion of the plan of this fairy-tale.

It begins with the story of a little chimney-sweep, Tom, who is brought by his hard master, Grimes, to sweep the chimneys of a great country-house. Whilst engaged in this occupation, he makes a wrong descent, and enters the chamber where the beautiful little daughter of the hall is lying asleep. She wakes in a fright, and the poor little sweep makes his escape up the chimney and over the roof, pursued by the household, whom the cries of the little lady alarm. He runs across a moor, clammers down a crag (well described), and is sheltered by the old mistress of a dame-school in a hay-loft. But waking up after some rest, he strays to wash himself in a stream, falls in, and is drowned. Then begins the allegorical part of the story. Tom becomes forthwith a "water-baby;" for it appears that, in Mr. Kingsley's imaginations, there is a new world under the waves, for infants—

"Quos dulcis vitæ exsortes et ab ubere raptos  
Abstulit atra dies."

It would be useless to analyse what is written in so vague and rambling a manner as most of what follows. It resembles, on a larger scale, a little German tale some of our readers may remember—"The Story without an End." Tom makes acquaintance with caddises and dragon-flies, lobsters and salmon, sea-anemones, sea-snails, and the other wonders beneath the waves. And he goes through a sort of probation with other little water-babies in S. Brandan's Isle, under the care of two fairies, one ugly and the other beautiful, called Mrs. Be-done-by-as-you-did and Mrs. Do-as-you-would-be-done-by, representing respectively the punishments of bad, and the rewards of conscientious, that is to say, principally of kind, actions. Meanwhile, Ellie, the little girl whom he had seen in his terrestrial existence asleep in the country-house, has died from a fall, that is, flown away on a pretty pair of fairy wings, and meets Tom in the sub-aqueous regions. Presently afterwards, the writer, apparently conscious that his allegory is weak, sends Tom off "to see the world," and he goes upon a long voyage of discovery to the "Other-end-of-nowhere," when he visits such countries as the Island of Polupragmosyne, the Land of Hearsay, the Isle of Tom-toddies (Laputa, borrowed from Captain Gulliver), and Old-wives-fabledom, ending by finding his old master Grimes, apparently in a model-prison, and finishing his own education by bringing that gentleman to a better frame of mind. Here and there (as some of these names will indicate) we observe a trace of the study of Rabelais, enough to give a sort of colour to the parable. And, to speak chemically, we may notice also the presence of the "Pilgrim's Progress" and of Southey's "Doctor." Mr. Kingsley has not failed here and there to aim a bird-bolt at the Catholic Church, showing bitter animosity under the veil of jesting. Thus his childish readers will learn to regard "monks and popes," together with famines, wars, measles, and quacks, as children of self-will, ignorance, fear, and dirt. These are things which some Protestants think us very touchy if we object to, in a finely-printed volume, rich with green and gold. They only show how all-penetrating is the atmosphere of anti-Catholic feeling which reigns in English literature.

*A Treatise on the True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.* By the Venerable Servant of God, LOUIS-MARIE GRIGNON DE MONTFORT. Translated from the original French by FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D.D., Priest of the Oratory. London: Burns & Lambert.

IT is impossible to notice this little volume without adverting to the circumstance that it is doubtful whether Father Faber will be still alive when these lines meet the reader's eye. It will be remarkable, indeed, if the last literary effort of one so singularly gifted with original power shall have been the humble work of translating, with scrupulously accurate fidelity, the treatise of another. It will be the worthy end of a life which has been animated throughout with most unusual simplicity of purpose by one prevailing motive—a self-abnegating zeal for the promotion of God's glory.

As to the treatise itself, it appears to us in many respects so singularly important, that we hope before long to treat it most carefully in a separate article. It may be questioned, indeed, whether the saintly author has not somewhat exaggerated the degree of divergence which exists between the special devotion to our Lady which he recommends, and that more ordinarily practised among Catholics. But so far as such divergence exists, it is the speciality of the Venerable Grignon's method to unite two characteristics which Protestants will persist in regarding as mutually contradictory. The devotion which he specially recommends will lead us, on the one hand, in quite a singular degree to interweave the remembrance of our Blessed Lady with every detail of our interior life; while, on the other hand, it will lead us in quite as singular a degree to make that remembrance ministrative to the unceasing thought of her Divine Son.

We will annex one remarkable extract in testimony against another Protestant misconception. Protestants commonly think that those who give extreme prominence to our Blessed Lady are on that very account disposed to tamper with the uncompromising strictness of Christian morality. Let them listen to the words of one who has certainly never been exceeded—who has probably never been equalled—in the prominence which he gives to Marian devotion:—

“*Presumptuous* devotees are sinners abandoned to their passions, or lovers of the world, who, under the fair name of Christians and clients of our Blessed Lady, conceal pride, avarice, impurity, drunkenness, anger, swearing, detraction, injustice, or some other sin. They sleep in peace in the midst of their bad habits, without doing any violence to themselves to correct their faults, under the pretext that they are devout to the Blessed Virgin. They promise themselves that God will pardon them; that they will not be allowed to die without confession; and that they will not be lost eternally, because they say the Rosary, because they fast on Saturdays, because they belong to the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary, or wear the scapular, or are enrolled in other congregations, or wear the little habit or little chain of our Lady. They will not believe us when we tell them that their devotion is only an illusion of the devil, and a pernicious presumption likely to destroy their souls. They say that God is good and merciful; that He has not made us to condemn us everlastingly; that no man is without sin; that they shall not die without confession; that one good Peccavi at the hour of death is

enough; that they are devout to our Lady; that they wear the scapular; and that they say daily, without reproach or vanity, seven Paters and Aves in her honour; and that they sometimes say the Rosary and the Office of our Lady, besides fasting, and other things. To give authority to all this, and to blind themselves still further, they quote certain stories, which they have heard or read—it does not matter to them whether they be true or false,—relating how people have died in mortal sin without confession; and then, because in their lifetime they sometimes said some prayers, or went through some practices of devotion to our Lady, how they have been raised to life again, in order to go to confession, or their soul been miraculously retained in their bodies till confession; or how they have obtained from God at the moment of death contrition and pardon of their sins, and so have been saved; and that they themselves expect similar favours. *Nothing in Christianity is more detestable than this diabolical presumption.* For how can we say truly that we love and honour our Blessed Lady, when by our sins we are pitilessly piercing, wounding, crucifying, and outraging Jesus Christ her Son? If Mary laid down a law to herself, to save by her mercy this sort of people, she would be authorising crime, and assisting to crucify and outrage her Son."

---

*Brevi Cenni intorno alla Vita e gli Scritti di Francesca de Maistre, con alcune Memorie di Benedetta Medolago Albani, nata De Maistre. Roma: coi Tipi della Civiltà Cattolica.*

WE have not ourselves had the opportunity of seeing this little volume, mentioned in the "Review of the Press," in the last number of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, but we are led to notice it in connection with an article appearing in the pages of the present REVIEW upon the life and writings of Rosa Ferrucci. These two sisters, who, from the name, would seem to be of French extraction, offered to the world a kindred example. Our reviewers compare the book containing the portrait of their sweet lives to a beautiful nosegay of many-tinted flowers—a remark which forcibly recalls to us our own feelings when we first became acquainted with that sweet flower of Northern Italy who has unconsciously revealed herself in unaffected outpourings of her own pen. What gives a singular value to these mystical flowers of virtue, our writers observe, is the nature of the place where they have flourished, which was not some solitary cloister, but in the midst of the world and the comforts and luxuries of a rich and noble family. Their sanctity was exhibited, not in any outward singularity, but in the most diligent attention to profit by every little occasion of merit, and by an extraordinary excellence in the most ordinary acts. Francesca arrived at a very high perfection, and took the three vows of religion in the world. To a sound Catholic education she must have been greatly indebted, as by nature she had dispositions which, under less propitious training, might have led to the formation of a very different character. We are told that she was by nature of a lively disposition, with a precocious understanding, an ardent heart, a tenacious attachment to her own opinion, and a want of moderation in her inclinations which disposed her towards exaggeration and singularity in her actions, and which might easily have passed into the eccentric. What abundant materials existed here for the formation of an indocile character! What a hotbed for the fostering



of the passions ! The discipline of Christian mortification, however, which she early learnt and perseveringly applied to all the minutæ of daily life, not only got the better of these natural defects, but turned all the strength and ardour of a mind which might have been so energetic for evil, to the practice of the most heroic virtue.

What is wanted is a more vigorous Christianity in our family training ; and how fruitful the results might be, such specimens may serve to show. If our education lack the gentle sternness of Christ's school, we must expect to reap an abundant harvest of superficiality, vanity, delicate self-indulgence, caprice, impertinence, and unreflecting worldliness, that desolator of all that is good or loving in the heart.

---

*"A New Series of Hymns and Sacred Part-Songs, for One, Two, Three, or Four Voices, with Accompaniment,"*—the music chiefly by living composers, edited by Frederick Westlake, A.R.A.M. (London : Lambert & Co., 17, Portman-street)—is an attempt, and we think a very successful one, to apply the resources of modern musical art to the illustration of devotional poetry, and thus to furnish what has hitherto been a desideratum in Catholic circles. The words are for the most part selected from the hymns and poems of Fathers Faber and Caswall, with a few miscellaneous pieces from Aubrey de Vere, Miss Procter, and other poets, and one or two prose verses from the Psalms. The music is of two different kinds. The first and main portion of each number consists of Catholic hymns of a comparatively simple character, for one or more voices ; while another is made up of longer pieces, intended apparently to occupy in sacred music a similar field to that which has been so well cultivated by Mendelssohn and others in their secular part-songs, &c. This latter portion will be an especial boon to our schools, colleges, and choral societies, as well as to Catholic families generally. As to the character of the music, it may well be left to speak for itself. Suffice it to say that the editor has been fortunate enough to secure the assistance of such musicians as Molique, Silas, Macfarren, Schulthes, Barnett, Fagan, Lutz, and others, and that one and all have done their best. We are glad to see that, besides the miscellaneous hymns which the present parts contain, the plan comprises also a complete series of Hymns and Part-songs for the feasts of Our Lady and of the chief Saints of the Church. We may have occasion hereafter to treat more at length the subject of English Catholic Hymnology. Meantime, the work before us has our best wishes for its successful progress. We may add that it is extremely cheap.

---

We have received a translation from the Italian of Father Croiset's work on *"Devotion to the Sacred Heart."* English books on this devotion are by no means so numerous as might have been expected from its singularly touching character. Every nation has its own defects, and the English are not so easily attracted as foreigners to *tenderness* of devotion. Precisely for this reason we hail with pleasure every new effort calculated to imbue them

with devotion to the Sacred Heart, tenderness being its one distinguishing characteristic. The work before us is most thoughtful and solid; filled with fervent affectionateness, while completely free from anything which could be deemed extravagant or fanatical. We most cordially recommend it.

We have been greatly interested in receiving the successive numbers of *The Lamp*. This unpretending periodical is doing a very important Catholic work; its contents are admirably adapted to the proposed end, and are often conspicuous for ability; while its general tone, so far as we have observed, is everything which could be desired.

Mr. Marshall has put forth a new edition of his most useful and elaborate work on Christian Missions; nor is his new edition a mere reprint of the former, but, on the contrary, contains many substantial improvements. The whole question which he raises, and indeed the whole subject of foreign missions, is one to which we would earnestly solicit the attention of English Catholics. At a very early period, therefore—most probably in our next number,—we shall take occasion to enlarge on those topics which Mr. Marshall's volumes so irresistibly suggest.

We see announced a work on the Holy House of Loreto, written by the late Father Hutchison in answer to Professor Stanley, of Oxford University. Monsignore Bartolini has also written an interesting work on the same theme. We hope, when Father Hutchison's work appears, to place before our readers a conspectus of the whole controversy.

---

## FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

---

*La Civiltà Cattolica*. Serie V., Vols. V. VI. Roma, 1863.

THE rich periodical literature of our time exercises one very important office—that of keeping those who have not leisure for extensive reading *au courant* of the critical questions of the day, and placing before them in a condensed and easily accessible shape the attained results of thought and study. But it has become so voluminous, that it requires to have something of the same office performed in its behalf, as it performs for the literary world at large. To supply this want in a measure, as respects subjects of general Catholic interest, we purpose from time to time to give an analysis of the more important papers that appear in the pages of foreign periodicals, among which the *Civiltà Cattolica* deservedly holds a prominent place.

The January numbers contain two interesting papers on the Temporal Power of the Popes. They are a continuation of a series of articles thrown

into the form of conversations. Three friends meet and discuss the subject. There is the advocate of the Catholic cause, the opponent imbued with the liberalism of the day, and a Neapolitan stranger desirous of fuller information, but whose sympathies are on the Catholic side. This mode of conducting an argument has its advantages; but it commonly errs by showing undue favour to its own side, making the automaton opponent cut his own throat, or rather that of the cause he espouses, in the most accommodating fashion; thus merely helping to show off the prowess of his adversary before becoming an easy conquest. The writers of the conversations before us are not chargeable with this defect. They allow the adversary to state his case fully and strongly, and, as yet, it must be added, he shows no signs of conversion.

In the first number of the present year the position assumed is, that the attack on the Temporal Power is really an attack on civil liberty. As a preliminary step towards proving this point, the advocate calls attention to the fact that the attack on the temporal power of the Pope is but a particular form of the war which the world has ever waged against the Church; which war, although really directed to the uprooting of the Church, can succeed only in despoiling it of all liberty of public and social action. That the attack in question has this largeness of scope, is evident both from the ferocity with which it is urged—a ferocity inexplicable from the mere fact of the Holy Father's temporal power forming an obstacle to Italian unity, since the heretics and revolutionists of all countries assail it with a like vehemence—and from the energy with which bishops, clergy, religious orders, and the Catholic laity generally, have declared themselves in favour of its maintenance. It is an instinct of self-preservation which has produced this almost unexampled unanimity. The Catholic world feels it is fighting *pro aris et focis*, for the palladium of ecclesiastical liberty. The necessity of the Pope's possessing an independent territory is all the more evident in the present day, now that particular Churches have lost their independent social action, through the progress of so-called liberal institutions. These local Churches have properly neither legal rights nor public action, save according to the good pleasure of the respective governments. Under these circumstances, their last and only support is the Holy See. To rob the Supreme Head of the Church of his temporal sovereignty, and thereby cripple his freedom and independence, would consequently be equivalent to reducing all particular Churches to slavery.

But in the liberty of the Church, civil liberty is itself implicated. The Catholic advocate shows that the true action of liberty was unknown before the establishment of Christianity. The problem of reconciling in each individual the dignity of the reasonable creature with the necessity of social dependence for the maintenance of order, is solved only by the submission of all to one Sovereign Ruler, which can be God alone. Hence the necessity of a spiritual power, the depository and interpreter of the oracles of God. The Catholic Church has provided the faithful with a treasure of speculative and practical truths, independent of the civil power; and in the Sovereign Pontiff proposes a living, present, and universal master for the teaching, preservation, and interpretation of these truths. Moreover, as faith teaches

that the powers of this world are constituted by God, the opprobrium of man's submission to his fellow man is thus removed : add to which, the civil power, whether wielded by an individual or by an assembly of men professing Christianity, could not arrogate to itself any authority in matters of conscience. As Christians, they would be themselves subject, in spiritual things, to the same authority ; and, as Christians, it would be their duty to procure the highest good of their subjects, and protect the Church in the exercise of her rights over conscience. Such is the true ideal of liberty introduced by the Church, avowed, acted upon, and, in a measure, carried out, previously to the introduction of modern theories of freedom.

The adversary objects :—Why, if this be so perfect a system, has one nation after another become intolerant of it, and sought to substitute the modern constitutional principles inaugurated in '89 ? [By modern constitutionalism, as the contest shows, the writers understand the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people as held by modern democrats, who maintain, not only that sovereignty is derived from the people, in the sense of their having the original inherent right to choose their governor and their form of government, but that this sovereignty is their immutable possession, and is exercised by the governing power simply as their organ : the ruler being the incarnation, so to say, of the sovereign will of the people—or rather of the majority of the people ; and, as he rules by their will, so may they at any time remove him at their pleasure. The two opposite poles of this system are despotism and revolution. It is needless to observe that our English notions of constitutionalism differ widely from those rife amongst continental liberals, and it is an unfortunate blunder, too common in this country, to confound the two ideas.]

The advocate replies that this work is not to be attributed to the people, except so far as they have been used as instruments ; rather they have everywhere been against the victims. The revolt to the spiritual power originated with the secular rulers. The pride which finds its highest gratification in political dominion could not endure that the noblest portion of man should escape from its rule, leaving it only the body to govern. Hence the desire of princes and governors to restrain, cripple, and, if possible, enslave the spiritual power—the great obstacle to the despotism of the State. So evident is this, that it is utterly inconceivable that it can be the love of liberty which is the motive of the war declared against the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, who is the sole remaining bulwark of the freedom of the human family.

The adversary rejoins :—But what have civil liberties to do with the Pontifical States, or their maintenance ? And how will the development of constitutional principles be hindered by “the High Priest returning to his nets ?”

The advocate thereupon develops his views of the consequences resulting from the principles of modern liberalism, which he considers to be subversive of genuine liberty. His argument is briefly this : that, while upholding the doctrine of popular sovereignty, it tends in reality to the absorption of all power by the State ; that the people are cheated into believing that they are in possession of the reins of government, because they enjoy the privilege, some dozen times in their lives, of throwing a ticket

into an electoral urn, in favour of some deputy they have perhaps never set eyes on, when all the while they are being despoiled of all actual voice and influence in their own affairs by the increasing interference of the omnipotent State in every department of social life—education, marriage, benevolence, traffic, industry, liberty of association, &c. The day when the Pope becomes a subject, there will be in the world as many specimens of the Pontifex Maximus as there are Cæsars great and small, who will pretend to govern souls as they rule the body. What human pride aims at, in short, in its war with the Pontiff, will then have been attained, and the human race will be abandoned to the empire of a few despots, ruling under the name of the sovereign people. So that, when “the high priest” returns to his nets, not “priests and friars, Canonici and Monsignori, only will be the sufferers;” but all amongst the laity who have any sentiment of the dignity of human nature, or who value the liberty and independence of conscience.

The subject of the next conversation is the objection to the temporal power of the Pope, drawn from the sacrifice of the interests of the Roman people to the supposed good of the Church at large. Grant, urges the opponent, that the advantages which accrue to the Christian world may be ever so great, you will never persuade me that three millions of human creatures must be sacrificed for the benefit of others; and that we must be deprived of liberty, independence, and what not, without hope of remedy, that the rest of the world may enjoy these blessings. The Neapolitan friend joins issue on this ground, and, after allowing for exaggeration, observes that the argument may be reduced to this compass:—That in the Pontifical States the special condition of the prince entails some inconvenience in the conduct of public affairs, and renders either difficult or impossible the enjoyment of certain civil advantages which would be otherwise easily attainable. Why is there not room here for the application of a maxim so much used and abused in the present times, viz., that individual good must give way to the universal benefit? He adds his impression that from what he has seen in the Pontifical dominions the evils cannot be of the magnitude asserted, while the compensations which these States enjoy in having Rome for their capital, and from the circumstance that Rome is the capital of the whole Catholic world, are manifest to all.

The advocate, while admitting the justice of the argument grounded on hypothetical concession, combats the hypothesis itself. And, first, he denies that the quality of Sovereign Pontiff in the prince, and the ecclesiastical character of some of his chief ministers, offer any necessary impediment to the real civil progress (*civiltà*) of his subjects: on the contrary, such an administration renders the advantages incidental to other forms of government more easy of attainment, besides possessing some that are proper to itself. That the ruler of the Roman people cannot, from the circumstance of his condition, make practical application of those modern ideas, the origin of which Cousin traces to Luther's day, he believes to be no misfortune to them; but he cannot conceive any duty incumbent on a good prince which may not be excellently, and even perfectly, performed by a priest or a pontiff. The end which the civil government and the priesthood pursue

being respectively the temporal and the eternal good of the same subject, man, the two offices, so far from being opposed to each other, must admirably agree and coincide. The good of the people also depends much more upon the men who work their institutions than upon the character of the institutions themselves. Imperfect institutions and good men will result in a tolerable government; excellent institutions and bad men will make a people miserable. The Neapolitan cordially agrees, and marvels at the intense occupation of the modern brain in framing new constitutions, and the little anxiety that is shown to improve men; whereas the Gospel, to which we owe the civil regeneration of the world, says not a syllable of public institutions, but is all directed to the correction and perfecting of the individual man; a proof positive that where these objects are effected the rest is sure to follow. Hence the advocate concludes that the surest guarantee of good civil government must ever lie in the Christian principles upon which that government is based and the Christian conscience of the governor. Now these securities exist most amply where it is an utter impossibility to separate the government from Christian principles, and where the conscience of the ruler is the conscience, not only of a Christian, but of a priest.

The adversary declines proceeding on the principles of logic and the *à priori* form of argument, and falls back upon facts. Under the dominion of priests, he says, the Roman people have become the most retrograde in all that regards civil progress, and the most miserable people on the face of the earth. The chief charges specified—for the actual vices of the administration are stated to be innumerable—are arbitrary government, favour prevailing over merit, inertness in the ruling power, which does nothing while others are doing so much, industry languishing, commerce hampered, legislation in confusion, privileged tribunals maintained, mendicity rife, priests and friars devouring a third, or perhaps the half, of the public fortune. The advocate replies, in the first place, that when a government is characterized as good, the epithet must be understood in a relative sense; so that, in predicating of the Roman people that they are well off, he means, not that things could not be better, but that they are well off by comparison with other people. Where anything is amiss in the administration of the government he is quite free to confess there is room for improvement. Secondly, and of this he is confident, that considering the difficulties of the times, and the peculiar embarrassments hence resulting to the Pontifical Government, for which, assuredly, it is not to be held responsible, public prosperity is maintained to a degree which might excite the envy of many secular governments, were there sharper eyes for perceiving the good, and less disposition to deny it when perceived. As charges of arbitrary government and inertness involve questions of fact, with facts alone, and not with sweeping and vague accusations, ought men to rest satisfied. And he shrewdly remarks that there are governments where, if a man spoke of the rulers as his opponent speaks of the Pope, he would long ago have been in the galleys or an exile in some distant, pestiferous colony. As for the political prisoners in the Roman States, believe me, he says, they have been convicted of something more than *thinking and speaking*. But how many in number, he inquires, do you suppose them to be? and remember, some were condemned before



the Piedmontese invasion had reduced the Roman States to their present narrow limits.—“Some thousands, it is believed at the caffès, but who knows?” So it might be, is the reply, if all had their deserts; but, as a matter of fact, the number is exactly fifty-three. And how many thousands, observes the Secretary, groan in the prisons of Italy, and especially of Naples, to whom not a thought is given; but then the gaolers of Naples are own brothers to the prisoners at Rome, and that makes all the difference.

With regard to the charge of confused legislation, he observes that the law of the Pontifical States is the ancient Roman, with such modifications as have been introduced from time to time during eight centuries, up to the present day, when other reforms are in contemplation. The law of the other European States is in a great measure grounded on the same system of jurisprudence; and as to the Roman law in particular, it has been admired and commended by high authority among the legists of other countries. As for the priests, monks, and nuns, he charges his opponent with regarding them as a strange race who have been rained down, as it were, from the skies, like so many locusts and caterpillars, to devour the people's substance. But are they not themselves an integral portion of the people, freely embracing a vocation by which they have the life-use of certain goods, and thus relieve their families, and thin the ranks of the needy and ambitious; not to speak of other inestimable advantages, even in the material order, which they procure for their countrymen? To look at the subject only from an economical point of view:—he has himself an uncle a canon, a brother a religious, and two nieces nuns. Now, as his family is far from rich, it has been, pecuniarily, a great relief that these relations have thus been provided for. Should the spoliation of Piedmont throw them on the world for maintenance, his domestic circumstances would be far from being bettered. And the same would be the case with thousands of families. As for the inertness of the Papal Government, in order to disprove it, it would be needful to recapitulate all that that Government has done and is doing—no slight task. For a detailed account he refers them to a little work bearing this very title, “Inertness of the Pontifical Government,” which treats of every branch of the administration, and specially of all that has been effected of late years for the advantage of industry and commerce. Well as he was acquainted with the activity of the Holy Father in promoting the good of his subjects, he confesses that he was quite amazed when he saw in a condensed form what he had hitherto only viewed in detail; he was amazed at the amount of the work accomplished in so short a time, and confirmed in his opinion that the Roman Government can stand in this respect a comparison with any other administration, especially when the smallness of the Pontifical States and their special difficulties from external causes are taken into account. Were it not for the Satanic enmity ever existing in the world against Christ and His Vicar, and the stupid prejudice which believes and repeats the worst, only because it has heard it, the truth of this assertion would be palpable to all. The opponent answers with a sneer that such documents are dictated by Government. “*Cicero pro domo sua*” must always be in the right. For his own part he never reads such productions. Here the Secretary interposes, and points out

to his friend the unfairness of refusing to hear both sides. Even were it true that the Government had a hand in the publication, it would be fair to hear what it had to say for itself; and, at any rate, facts and statistics can be verified. But such documents, rejoins the opponent, abound with the most monstrous assertions. Witness an assertion in a journal which he found some friends of his were perusing the other day, to this effect:—That the Roman people were “the most comfortable in circumstances, the most civilized, and the freest in the world.” The Secretary owns that this was going too far. The advocate, however, joins issue, and maintains that there is truth in the assertion, when the words “people,” “liberty,” “civilization,” and “easy circumstances” are taken in the sense attached to them by the writer.

Some observations follow upon the ambiguity of the term “people,” and the abuse that is made of it. The collective word, which imports universality, has a very clear meaning when that which is attributed to it is in its nature universal. To say the people wish to be well off, need food and clothing, &c., is to say what is true without exception; but when we come to speak of votes, opinions, aspirations, exigencies, affections, inclinations, it is plain that in all these cases, where free will steps in and differences of judgment exist, universality is not to be found, so nothing can be more incorrect than to speak of what the people wishes or thinks, as certain men do. For instance, they who affirm that the Roman people desire to have nothing more to do with the Pope and his government, cannot maintain that their assertion is *literally* true, taking the word “people” in its universal sense; for the clergy and monks, and their favourers are, after all, people in as true a sense as the rest, and it is not fair to exclude them. They also are people who in crowds show their spontaneous affection and reverence to the Holy Father on all public occasions; so that the “universality” is a conception of the mind rather than a real entity. But the majority—what of them? How (is the reply) has this majority been ascertained, and when? In fact, what our opponent means by “the people” is themselves—the revolutionary party, who are very far from constituting the numerical majority. When we speak of liberty, well-being, and civil prosperity, the signification of the word *people* should be restricted to the true multitude, which consists mainly of artisans, labourers,—what are termed the common people. Now it is the distinguishing glory of the Roman Pontiffs that their truly Christian rule has been directed to securing the well-being and happiness of the great mass of the population.

The subject of squalidness and mendicity is treated in the succeeding number. I pray you to consider, observes the advocate, that if the Pope should desire to sweep Rome clear of all its uncleanness, and of all its beggars, he could do it easily within twenty-four hours. He need only fulminate an order for every one to keep clean the space before his house under a severe penalty for neglect, and another forbidding begging, and sending beggars to prison. Apply this remedy, and to-morrow morning you shall have Rome as clear of dirt and beggars as Oxford Street or the Rue de Rivoli. But if the thing be so easy, why is it not done? That is a question upon which our friend has something to say hereafter; for the present all he will say is this, that if for some reason the Pope has not seen fit, and does

not see fit, to do it, it is only natural that the needy man should avail himself of the right, which modern society denies him almost everywhere else, of holding out his hand to his fellow-creature for alms. What wonder that where paupers are not merely tolerated in the public streets, but pitied and relieved—where the Christian mother puts an obolo into her baby's hand, and bids it give it to the beggar for the love of God—what wonder that the poor should not only show themselves but even throng the thoroughfares? The greater part of the beggars in Rome, in fact, have been ascertained not to be natives of the States; and the late annexations of Piedmont have greatly added to their number.

As to the further question, how paupers should be dealt with, of course there are two views. You may immerse them in workhouses, where they may be stintily provided for, and the delicacy of the rich and voluptuous may be spared the spectacle of squalid misery and the annoyance of importunity. This is one way; but it happens not to be the Pope's way at Rome. We proceed on other principles, and where living by alms *may* be a practice of evangelical perfection, the doing so from blameless need cannot be reputed a crime. The number of beggars in Rome is to be taken, not as the measure of want, but rather of that general easiness of circumstances which enables men to give, and, above all, the Christian feeling which prompts them to be charitable to the poor. Then follows a contrast between the Christian mode of regarding the poor and that of the social economists of our day. The advocate, however, does not disguise the inconveniences and abuses which may, and often do, follow from the liberty of asking alms; but this he contends is a reason, not for abrogating a Christian right, but for keeping it within due limits. The Popes, in several of their Bulls, have shown themselves quite aware of the evil of people begging, who might and ought to work, and thus living idly on the earnings of others. [In fact, an authoritative notification was issued at Rome, March 30th of the current year, imposing considerable restrictions upon mendicancy. By the provisions of this regulation, begging is limited to such as are proper objects of charity, and the importunity even of those licensed to ask alms is checked, since they are forbidden to beg *within* the churches, or inside shops, inns, caffès, &c. The mendicants who crowd in from the neighbouring country, and have obtained no legal settlement in Rome, are to be sent back to their own parish, or to the frontier.]

The line of argument pursued in these papers, it will be observed, is based on principles rather than on an accumulation of facts and statistics. Those at a distance are apt to mistrust official reports, and to suspect that, granting the facts to be as stated, a catena might be produced on the other side. But if it can be proved that such practical grievances as exist in the Roman States, do not spring from any cause *essential to priestly rule*, or, at most, are abuses of a principle good in itself, much will have been effected in the way of disarming hostile prejudice, where it is founded only on ignorance and misconception. The remaining paper chiefly respects the amount of personal liberty possessed by the Roman people; in particular, their immunity from the conscription, and the educational advantages enjoyed by the poor; and those not only of a moral and intellectual kind, but also æsthetic

—a branch of education which has come to be considered, in the present day, even by the advocates of mere secular progress, as of great importance in the work of civilization.

---

*Le Correspondant.* Paris : Douniol. 1863.

FROM the many papers worthy of notice, we single out a very able one, entitled *La Diplomatie du Suffrage Universel*, from the pen of Albert de Broglie. A new principle has gained a footing in the public law of Europe during the last thirty years, viz., the absolute right which every state possesses of changing, by universal suffrage, its internal constitution, modifying all its international relations, and emancipating itself from all treaties and general conventions. The object of the writer is to indicate the difficulties and perils attached to the carrying out of this new principle, which is fast sweeping away, if it has not already swept away, all the results of the accumulated experience of ages, during which the problem has been, How to enable nations to live side by side in peace and independence,—in fact, to establish an international law of order and justice. The difficulty of enforcing a law, for the due observance of which no tribunal exists which has been accepted, even in theory, since Europe emerged from the middle ages, suggested the principle of the balance of power; the rights of the minor states being placed under the guardianship of the greater ones, bound by treaties to that effect. To the maintenance of this principle—imperfectly as it has been observed (witness the iniquitous partition of Poland)—Europe owes whatever years of peace and security she has enjoyed since its first adoption. Two things (says the writer) have hitherto served as guarantees to the peace of Europe: first, a fact—equality maintained amongst a few great powers; next, a right—an engagement, explicit or tacit, not to alter, without common consent, the re-partition of territory agreed upon. It is evident that the new theory entirely destroys the latter condition, and thus leads, by necessary consequence, to the destruction of the first. Every little State being able to vote its annexation to a greater, without any one having the right to oppose the transaction, this mode of acquisition becomes equivalent to a conquest: we have only a change of the form and of the terms employed.

Along with the destroyed equilibrium disappears the hitherto recognised law, the sole remaining barrier which modern civilization had devised to check the development of the “egoistical personality” of any people. Have we not reason, then, to dread what we may well regard as the inevitable goal to which this new principle tends,—the formation, with time, of a preponderating power swelled by the superposition of conquests—annexation, if you will—deriving from its victory of yesterday the strength to satisfy its fancy of to-morrow; the earth groaning under its weight, and strewed with the ruins it has made. The writer proceeds to discuss the illusive notions of those who imagine that all national rivalries are about to disappear in the great fraternity of democratic institutions; and another equally potent panacea anticipated in the principle of nationality, by the carrying out of

which every people will settle down according to its natural affinities, and the chief causes of war thus be removed. For the discussion of these points we refer our readers to the essay itself.

In the number for April appeared an article on Colenso and the Anglican Church, by the Abbé Meignan. Speaking of the choice made of the "missionary bishop," and of Dr. Colenso's antecedents and personal call to that office, the reviewer says: "Theological science had no peculiar attractions for him, neither had his evangelical zeal made itself remarkable—but what of that? The vocation of a missionary destined to evangelize the savages of the Cape is not apt, in England, to be developed amongst those whose position and education point them out for the more lucrative foreign posts. Men are, perhaps, unjust, and do not make sufficient allowance for circumstances, when, with some of the English newspapers, they throw blame on those who chose Dr. Colenso for the see of Natal. In such cases, people must, in a measure, take what they can get: geographers, botanists, clerks who are bored at home and would like to see the world." With that light and lively touch in which the French excel, and to which the French language so admirably lends itself, the Abbé proceeds to describe, in a few words, the Bishop's conversion, or rather perversion, by his black neophyte, and all that ensued, with which the English public are well acquainted.

With respect to the book itself, the Abbé observes: "We should have expected from a bishop, although but newly enrolled amongst the Rationalist recruits of the day, on the other side of the Channel, something more profound, less narrow, less feeble, and, above all, less superannuated. The authors of the 'Essays and Reviews' had been more careful of their reputation: true, they invented nothing themselves, but at least they borrowed cleverly. Bunsen had furnished them with a whole arsenal of modern arguments, and although it was perceptible that such cloudy sophisms had never been the production of the manly and vigorous good sense of the English people, still it was clear that, while handling biblical questions somewhat at random, at least, they took them up in their modern form, and had the intention of treating them from the nineteenth century point of view. But Dr. Colenso, in his first volume, carries us back at once to the eighteenth century. We have Voltaire again, without his coarse sarcasm—but also without his genius; Voltaire compounded with the close arithmetician; Voltaire judging antiquity, which he has never studied, according to the vulgar ideas (*idées bourgeoises*) of his time." The reviewer then sums up briefly the chief difficulties or impossibilities which Colenso has discovered for himself in the sacred text—for himself, for he has since acknowledged that their novelty was but relative; "new to myself and very many of my readers." The second volume the Abbé considers a little less superannuated than the first, but says that the hypothesis on which it is grounded dates from the seventeenth century. The few remarks which he makes in the way of reply are rather cursory suggestions than direct answers, but we may quote the following observation:—

"The books [of Holy Scripture] were written originally only for those familiar with tradition; and passages which appear to us inexplicable now,

because unexplained, were clear enough to them. The conciseness of the Bible, its reticences, transpositions, and the liberty it allows itself in the use of language, are known to all philologists. The sacred books ought to be explained by men of learning, and not abandoned to the interpretations of ignorant pedants, who make their own impressions the ground of absurd objections against a text which they do not understand, and which, in the entirety of its scope, their minds will never be competent to grasp. English Protestants, those prodigal sowers of bibles, will soon be obliged to do justice to the needful reserve and practical wisdom of the Catholic Church in its use of Holy Scripture."

But the main object of the reviewer is not to drag to light the poverty of Dr. Colenso's arguments, but to expose the situation in which the Anglican Church is placed by the Rationalist movement now in progress even amongst the higher ranks of her clergy: the powerlessness of the prosecutions directed against the impugners of the Thirty-nine Articles, the complicity of the laity, and the impossibility in which the Anglican bishops find themselves of expelling the convicted culprits; in all which he sees a commencement of organic decomposition in the body of the Established Church. Dr. Colenso's writings must be viewed, not in their own intrinsic worthlessness, but as a significant token that the Rationalism which had already insinuated itself amongst the Anglican clergy, as is proved by the "*Essays and Reviews*," is now striving to obtain for itself a recognised position. Will it succeed? We are but at the beginning of a contest the importance of which is not to be estimated either by the powers of the assailants, which are no way extraordinary, or by their published works, which are argumentatively feeble. What constitutes its real importance is, on the one hand, the growing strength of the assailing force, and, on the other, the progressively diminishing vigour of the defence. Of the refutations put forth by Anglican bishops and others, Catholics of course have nothing to say but what is favourable; many might be unreservedly commended, if the authors had not thought it advisable to cater for a little popularity by gross abuse of the Catholic Church; but when we come to look at the effect produced, we should fall into a great mistake if we imagined that it was by any means considerable.

As the Abbé justly observes, "When a book comes opportunely to give expression to ideas that are working in men's minds, it is read by every one; but the interest it excites exhausts the popular curiosity. The refutations attract but little notice, being read chiefly by persons whose opinions already coincide with those of the writers; so that the very number of these refutations does little more than attest the success of the attack. The favour with which the public received the '*Essays and Reviews*' was not checked by the answers they elicited. The professors only obtained a little more popularity, and the preachers a little more notoriety. The prelates then betook themselves to the law, but only to render more patent the weakness of their Church. Possessing no spiritual authority, they can merely give an opinion; they can pronounce no judgment, save through tribunals in which lay judges have usurped the place of ecclesiastical. Moreover, these judges do not pretend to pronounce upon truth or error; so that their judgment, if in accordance with the wishes of the friends of orthodoxy, can be of no ecclesiastical weight—it is simply a legal decision whether or no a doctrine is



in agreement with the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. Everybody knows very well that the 'Essays and Reviews,' as well as Colenso's book, are contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles—they knew it quite as well before the Court of Arches pronounced its decision as they did afterwards. What people feel to be the real question is, whether the Thirty-nine Articles are conformable to truth. The sentence of a year's suspension, without any call for retraction, was nothing short of derisory. It virtually left the Rationalists encamped on the field. It was the first step to a victory. It were needless to point out what an advantage Colenso draws from the issue of the proceedings instituted against the 'Essays and Reviews.' He boldly attacks the faith of the Church and the Thirty-nine Articles, and he calls on the clergy to revolt against the Episcopacy and the law. He looks for the support of the clergy." After quoting some passages from the work, in which Colenso complains of the captivity of thought and conscience under which the Anglican clergy groan through the tyrannical obligations of their ordination oath, an increasing horror of which is deterring the flower of England's intellectual youth from entering its ranks, the reviewer observes that all these complaints would be so much empty declamation if the Anglican Church rested upon any sure basis; for every society has the right to expel from its bosom those who contravene the conditions which are essential to its existence. If the Thirty-nine Articles are its constitutive act, who that attacks this charter can have a right to grumble at being turned out?

But men naturally feel that the question is not so simple, and that the situation is complicated by the anarchical principles of Protestantism; for Protestantism, as every one knows, rests upon the right of private judgment and individual criticism. The Anglican Church set up the pretension of remaining Catholic while separating from the Head of the Catholic Church: Dr. Colenso and his party, in their turn, claim a right to continue Anglicans while rejecting the principles of the Anglican Church. What dogmatic value have the statutes of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth? Do these names represent any theological authority? If, then, they have no other value than have other State laws and political acts, why, in a country where all laws are reformable by an appeal to public opinion and Parliament, should Colenso and his friends be debarred the right to attack the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, which may be suppressed by the same authority that enacted them? This it is which renders the religious question now agitating England one of so serious a nature. The Anglican Church can oppose to the innovators only Articles without authority, and the external rigours of the law. The Anglican prelates endeavour, indeed, to use a better weapon, and appeal to theological reasons, tradition, and sound criticism. But theological discussion will never exercise any control over minds. Discussion awakens doubt. Authority alone can settle the question and put an end to debate. What has happened in Germany, in Holland, and in all countries where free discussion has had no corrective and moderator in legitimate authority, the reviewer apprehends will eventually take place in England. The masses love novelty, and the attack will triumph over the defence. It is already a significant fact that the number of copies sold of the "Essays and Reviews" in 1862 amounted to 20,000, while the "Aids to

Faith," by the Archbishop of York, found only 7,000 purchasers. "The pioneers of the future" (to use the expression of a Rationalist journal) "are not all outside the Church : within it there are the Maurices, the Kingsleys, the authors of the *Essays*, Colenso." Neither is there unanimity even among the bishops themselves ; witness the late charge of Dr. Tait, the Anglican Bishop of London, who deprecates judicial prosecutions in matters of dogma. "After all," he says, "we are Protestants, and have been accustomed to value highly the right and duty of private judgment." The Abbé concludes his review by a consoling reflection which, as Catholics, will suggest itself to us all :—"We, too, have a battle to wage with the Rationalists of the day ; but how different the terms of the contest, how different the certainty of its issue !"

#### NOTE TO ARTICLE ON FRENCH ELECTIONS.

As we are going to press we observe an announcement in the *Weekly Register*, which, as containing a correction of a statement made, as it appears, on insufficient information, by the writer of the above-mentioned article, we deem of sufficient importance to present to our readers. It is as follows :—Certain English newspapers "a few weeks back drew very large conclusions from the support given by the Bishop of St. Brieuc, in Brittany, to the Government candidate against the Count de Montalembert. About the same time it was stated that the Bishop had deprived the printer to the diocese of his office, held by his family for near two hundred years, for his support of the Count. In the Bishop's letter contradicting this calumny, he dropped an expression implying that the Count de Montalembert's candidature was too late. We have now the opportunity of explaining upon good authority what the circumstances thus alluded to really were. The Bishop, it will be seen, could not state them publicly. In the original programme of candidates supported by the Emperor's Government, M. de Persigny had put down for the department Côtes-du-Nord, which is conterminous with the diocese of St. Brieuc, a gentleman against whom the Bishop and clergy felt the strongest objection. The Bishop felt this so strongly that he sought an interview with the Emperor and stated his objections. They were received in a manner honourable to both parties. The objectionable candidate was withdrawn and another substituted, to whom the Bishop promised his support. It was after this that the Count de Montalembert was proposed. We can imagine nothing more painful to a Catholic bishop than any circumstance which made it appear as if he were opposed to a man so distinguished, to whom the cause of religion and of the Church owes so much, and who has never hesitated to sacrifice to it his dearest personal interests. We cannot doubt that the Bishop of St. Brieuc, if he had consulted his feelings and wishes, would, like the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon, have called his clergy together and declared his opinion that it would be a disgrace to them all if such a candidate as Montalembert did not receive their unanimous support. But the Bishop was bound by his previous promise, on the strength of which the Government candidate had been selected."